

THE
QUARTERLY REVIEW
OF
THE EVANGELICAL LUTHERAN CHURCH.

OCTOBER, 1885.

ARTICLE I.

OF GOOD WORKS.*

AUGSBURG CONFESSION, ART. XX.

By E. HUBER, D. D., Philadelphia, Pa.

The Article, which it falls to our lot to consider at this time, is an answer to the charge of prohibiting good works—a charge of sufficiently serious character to warrant the full and earnest reply made to it by our Confessors at Augsburg. For, if substantiated, it overthrows our doctrine concerning justification by faith, and thus deprives us of our chief reason for existing as a distinct church, destroys the main foundation upon which our superstructure is reared, cuts the central root that gives subsistence and richness to our life, and leaves us as witnesses of God in the unenviable position of persons occupying the various thoroughfares of life cruelly and wickedly engaged in showing men, who ask the way to heaven, into the broad road that leads to death and hell.

This charge is one that was very common in the time of the Reformation, but is not confined to that period, as it continues to be repeated even to this day, and that not by Catholics only,

*Holman Lecture on the Augsburg Confession, for 1885, delivered in the Theological Seminary, Gettysburg, Pa., June 16, 1885.

but frequently also by Protestants themselves. On this account we propose to consider this article independently of the circumstances under which it originated, and irrespective of time, place or creed, accord the privilege of a hearing to all who, expressly or by implication, have anything to say in substantiation of the immoral effects of our teaching on the subject of faith.

In the first place, let us seek to attain to a definite understanding of the nature of the offence with which we stand charged. "Our writers," says the article itself, "are falsely accused of prohibiting good works." Now by good works here are not meant the unprofitable things generally understood by the term in its technical Romish sense, but everything whatever that God has commanded us to become and to do in his word; not the works justly characterized by our article as childish and needless, such "as keeping of holidays, set fasts, fraternities, pilgrimages, worshiping of saints, the use of rosaries, monkery and such like things," but the moral virtues, the fruits of the Holy Spirit, and the righteous conduct and Christian life thence proceeding.

Now these works, thus understood, they accuse us of forbidding. By this, however, they do not mean to charge us with disapproving and condemning the good works themselves and therefore discountenancing and opposing them for their own sake, but, that we hold and teach such views concerning justification as virtually and practically amounts to the prohibition of the very graces and duties enjoined by God himself.

The attack, accordingly, is aimed at the very citadel of our Protestant faith—the article gloried in as the one with which the Church stands or falls; and the charge of prohibiting good works is merely the weapon with which our stronghold is to be demolished—the evidence that justification as taught by us is an invention of man and not a truth of the word that endureth forever.

That the point of assault is where we have represented, is evident from the whole contents of our article, which is, from beginning to end, a setting forth and defence of the doctrine of faith; as also from the Romish Confutation in which this article

of our Confession is entirely rejected on the ground that it teaches "that good works do not merit the remission of sins."

Understanding now what the indictment is which is preferred against us, let us ascertain what proof they propose to furnish to sustain the same. The arguments mainly relied on to convict us of guilt may be reduced to the three following: 1. The manners and lives of those who hold that we are justified by faith, are corrupt and ungodly; therefore the doctrine itself must be false and immoral. 2. In various passages in which faith is spoken of, the leading Reformers have plainly and expressly declared that good works are of no consequence if only men do not cease to believe. 3. The logical and inevitable tendency of the doctrine that faith alone justifies, is to produce indifference to righteousness and holiness; for if by faith, without the deeds of the law, we are forgiven, accepted of God and made heirs of eternal life, then we have need of nothing further. Or, as Luther himself has put this last objection, "If faith does everything and by itself suffices for our justification, why then are good works commanded?"

That the three specified propositions contain the substance of the arguments ordinarily employed in support of the charge that the Protestant view of justification discourages morality, may be seen from the following specific statements and facts gathered from various sources.

Cardinal Bellarmine one of the most eminent of Roman Catholic theologians and controversialists, who lived in the latter half of the 16th century and a part of the 17th, is quoted by Bishop Davenant of the English Church as follows: "We prove that Luther used to deny the necessity of good works, from the lives and manners of his followers: who in consequence of this teaching abandon themselves to all wickedness with such incredible licentiousness that it became quite needful for Luther to praise good works and to exhort to the practice of them." Here the excessive wickedness said to be prevalent among the followers of the great Reformer, is boldly ascribed to the peculiar doctrine taught by him in opposition to that of the Church of Rome.

Archbishop Spalding of this country in his *History of the Protestant Reformation* devotes a long chapter to the influence

of the Reformation on morals. In this he professes to give an analysis of the testimony of the leading Reformers themselves as to the practical moral results of their own teaching. This testimony is gathered by the *Dublin Review* from a work by Dr. Döllinger and inserted by Spalding in the chapter referred to. Luther is the first and most important witness. He testifies as follows: "Everything is reversed, the world grows worse every day for this teaching; and the misery of it is that men are nowadays more covetous, more hardhearted, more corrupt, more licentious and more wicked than of old under the Papacy.

* * * Our evangelicals are now sevenfold more wicked than they were before. In proportion as we hear the gospel, we steal, lie, cheat, gorge, swell and commit every crime." The writer of the article in the *Review* further adds that "it could hardly be expected that Luther would himself attribute this universal depravity, the presence of which he thus frankly acknowledges, to the influence of his own gospel. But he cannot and does not conceal that such was the popular impression concerning it. * * * Indeed, not to multiply evidence of a fact so notorious, he himself acknowledges that the peasants, through the influence of the gospel, have become utterly beyond restraint and think they may do as they please. They no longer fear hell or purgatory but content themselves with saying 'I believe, therefore I shall be saved;' and they become proud, stiff-necked mammonists and accursed misers, sucking the very substance of the country and the people."

Not having access to the work of Döllinger's from which the extract is collected, we are not in a position to verify it by comparison with Luther's writings, but, damaging as the testimony may be, we presume its genuineness must be admitted from the character of the several writers, from the evidence furnished by the style which is evidently that of Luther, as also from the fact that the state of things described is confirmed by statements derived from Protestant sources, as, for example, that of Köstlin which will be given a little further on.

Melanchthon is next called up and he bears witness as follows: "In these latter times the world has taken to itself a boundless license; very many are so unbridled as to throw off every bond

of discipline, though at the same time they pretend that they have faith, that they invoke God with true fervor of heart, and that they are lively and elect members of the church; living meanwhile in truly cyclopean indifference and barbarism and in slavish subjection and adulteries, murders and atrocious crimes."

This frightful state of morality, according to the authority from whom Spalding quotes, "is attributed without disguise even by the Lutherans themselves to the doctrines of Luther already alluded to."

Köstlin, the Protestant author of a recent life of Luther, gives a picture of the spiritual condition of Wittenberg, the very centre of Protestant light and life, but little less dark than the representations given in Spalding's awful chapter. He says, "But more painful and harrassing to him (Luther) than even the threats of the Romanists and the attacks upon his teaching, which his own words, he was convinced, had long since refuted, was the condition of Wittenberg and the university. It was a favorite reproach against him of the Catholics that his doctrine yielded no fruits of strict morality. Notwithstanding all the rebukes which he had uttered for years, we hear of the old vices still rampant at Wittenberg—the vices of gluttony, of increasing intemperance and luxury, especially at baptisms and weddings; of pride in dress and the low-cut bodices of ladies; of rioting in the streets; of the low women who corrupted the students; of extortion, deceit, and usury in trade; and of the indifference and inability of the authorities and the police to put down open immorality and misdemeanors." Elsewhere the fact is mentioned that the condition of things described by Köstlin was so intolerable to Luther that he had made up his mind to quit the place and was with difficulty dissuaded from this purpose "by the united intercessions of the Elector and of the authorities of the university and of the town."

From the admirable work of Archdeacon Hare on Luther we learn that even the character of the great Reformer himself was frequently assailed in the Church of England, for the purpose of bringing discredit upon the peculiar truths brought to light and so ably and successfully established by his voice and pen. The period referred to is the second quarter of the present cen-

tury—a period made memorable in the English Church by the rise and spread of Tractarianism and the excited controversies that broke out in consequence.

Referring to this movement Mr. Hare says, "Moreover, since that disastrous cloud has come over the religious minds of England, which leads so many of our divines to decry the Reformation and its authors, the most unfounded charges against Luther have found acceptance with many, who catch them up with a parrot-like volubility in repeating ugly words. Therefore seeing that Luther's character is so closely connected with that of the Reformation, it must needs seem desirable that Luther's name should be cleared from all unmerited stigmas."

Again near the close of this volume this same writer, in justifying the size to which his book had grown, says, "But the question of Luther's character is intimately connected with the miserable controversies which are now disturbing our church; and though the decision of these controversies ought to turn on wholly different points, the enemies of Protestant truth have always felt they were gaining an advantage, if they could, by whatever artifices, detract from the fame of its first and greatest champion."

Facts such as those thus far given show very plainly, that in opposing the truth concerning justification, the adversaries place no little dependence upon the argument based upon the establishment of the immoral character of its advocates and professors.

The second argument relied on by our gainsayers is that the very leaders of the Reformation in discussing faith have said expressly that good works are of no consequence, provided only that men do not cease to believe. The inference is very plain. If the people are taught to regard faith as the only thing that is essential and good works are spoken of disparagingly by the side of faith, then the neglect of the moral law will follow as a natural consequence.

The passages relied on to establish the fact of this direct and express immoral teaching are, however, far from being as numerous and plain as is desirable for the purpose intended; in truth, they are significantly few when it is remembered how

ample si the field from which they might be gathered, Luther alone having published no less than seven hundred and fifteen different works during his life time, "sending them forth at one period," as Mr. Hare says, "almost like flights of birds." But few as they are, all that is possible has been made out of them to the detriment of a doctrine humiliating and hateful to the pride and self-righteousness of the unrenewed heart. But let us hear the accusers themselves.

Cardinal Bellarmine says: "Protestants think that man can be saved although he does no good works, nor observes the Divine commands. This I prove from the words of Luther; for in his book on Christian Liberty he thus writes: 'Good works do not make a man good, nor bad ones make him bad.' Also in another passage he says: 'Where there is faith, no sin can hurt.' Concerning these extracts Davenant says: 'These and other things of the same kind, Bellarmine has scraped together from parts of Luther's writings to make it be supposed that the necessity of good works is entirely set aside by the Reformer.'"

Möehler, theological professor at Munich, in his celebrated work on Symbolism, cites for condemnation the following passage of Luther's from his "Babylonish Captivity": Now thou seest how rich is the Christian or the baptized man; for though he will, he cannot lose his salvation, however great his sins may be, unless he refuse to believe. No sin can damn him but unbelief alone."

In a foot note this same author gives another extract from a letter by Luther to Melancthon: "Sin lustily but be yet more lusty in faith and rejoice in Christ, who is the conqueror of sin, of death and of the world. Sin we must, so long as we remain here. It suffices that through the riches of the glory of God, we know the Lamb which taketh away the sins of the world; from Him no sin will sever us, though a million times in a day we should commit fornication or murder." This certainly seems to grant all the license to sin that the most depraved heart could ask for.

Nampon in his "Catholic Doctrine" quotes the same passage giving parts not found in the preceding extract: "If you preach grace preach the reality and not the appearance of it; if grace

be a reality, bring it a true and substantial sin (to cure) and not a mere semblance of sin. Sin then and sin stoutly, but still more stoutly trust and rejoice in Jesus Christ who is the conqueror of sin and death and the world." Then after stating that sin, however often committed, will not separate us from Christ, he concludes his quotation with the following sentence: "Can you believe that a Lamb so precious has not superabundantly paid the ransom of all our crimes?"

Melanchthon is also cited by these two authors as expressing sentiments almost equally as objectionable as those taken from Luther. These extracts are, of course, produced by these writers for the purpose of showing that, as Moehler expressed it, "by the side of faith the greatest sins can be committed."

Again, Moehler in his chapter on good works, after having asserted that we deny all internal connection between salvation and holiness, illustrates and supports his assertion by the opposition excited against George Major for teaching that good works are necessary to salvation. Though Major's object was to counteract the neglect of the Divine precepts, so prevalent among members of the church, yet he was finally obliged to give up the use of this form of expression.

Melanchthon also at one time approved and employed this same formula, to prevent misapprehension of the doctrine of justification by faith alone, but subsequently omitted it from his writings.

At a colloquium held in Worms by appointment of king Ferdinand in hope of bringing about a union between the Catholics and the Lutherans, this hostility to the necessity of good works for salvation was again manifested, especially on the part of the Saxon deputies. These more rigid Lutherans insisted on it that, before entering into a conference with the Catholics, certain errors, claimed to be held by a considerable portion of the adherents to the Augsburg Confession, should be condemned. One of these errors thus to be rejected is our famous proposition—good works necessary to salvation. To this demand Melanchthon ultimately and after much hesitation agreed, though not soon enough to prevent our Weimar theologians from withdrawing from the conference.

Besides it is a well known fact that the Formula of Concord, one of the acknowledged Confessions of the church, rejects this proposition as inconsistent with the words of the apostle Paul. Now in this determined opposition to the formula before us and in its final total rejection, there does seem to be plain and decided evidence in favor of the charge that our doctrine does "prohibit good works."

The last argument, and the one mainly relied upon to make good the accusation of favoring immorality is that the logical and inevitable tendency of the doctrine of justification by faith alone is to produce neglect of the moral law. Owen, in his work on justification, speaking of several things which are generally pleaded against this doctrine by Papists, Socinians &c., says: "The first and fountain of all others is that the doctrine of justification by the imputation of the righteousness of Christ renders our personal righteousness needless and overthrows all necessity of a holy life."

The *Christian Observer*, an able periodical of England and a staunch and powerful defender of the evangelical faith against the whole Oxford school of divinity, remarks, in the volume for 1836, "that parties who taught justification by faith and *something else* accused all who opposed it of sapping the foundation of moral virtue."

Bossuet in his "Variations of Protestantism" says, speaking of Melancthon: "He saw himself always pressed with this question of the Catholics: if we are agreeable to God independently of all good works, and all fulfilling of the law, even of that which the Holy Ghost works in us, how and whereto are good works necessary? Melancthon perplexed himself in vain to ward off this blow and to elude this dreadful consequence: therefore good works according to you are not necessary."

Nampon, already referred to, writes thus: "When men wish to emancipate themselves upon a system from all laws human and divine they may imagine many such systems." Then after having mentioned Pantheism and Fourierism as two of these systems, he describes a third according to which "men may acknowledge sin, recognize it in themselves, but proclaim that

it is necessary, unavoidable * * * and at the same time perfectly compatible with the friendship of God, predestination to life and with salvation. Of these three systems the last seems to me to be the worst. It is degrading, void of consolation, inconsistent and immoral; nevertheless it is that which was eagerly adopted by the leading doctors of the Reformation, by the Lutherans and still more by the Calvinists." Here the audacious assertion is made that the Lutheran doctrine of justification by faith is a system devised for the express purpose of setting men free from all laws human and divine—a system framed designedly to allow men to live according to all the lusts of their evil hearts and yet at the same time enable them to cherish the hope that they are in favor with God and shall inherit everlasting life.

Socinus charges Protestant divines with teaching "that God justifieth the ungodly, not only those that are so and whilst they are so, but although they continue so; that they required no inherent righteousness or holiness in any one nor could do so on their own principles, seeing the imputed righteousness of Christ is sufficient for them, although they live in sin, are not washed nor cleansed, nor give themselves up to the ways of duty and obedience to God whereby he may be pleased, and so bring in libertinism and antinomianism into the Church." These plainly expressed views of this bold heretic are gathered by Owen from a treatise written by Socinus in opposition to the doctrine of the imputation of Christ's satisfaction.

Even the Quakers, as shown by Moehler in citations from Barclay and other Friends, who have confounded justification and sanctification very much after the manner of the Catholics, making the former to depend on a work wrought in us and corresponding in degree to the progress of that internal work, whilst commending Luther for opposing the mere external works of the Catholic Church, yet censure him for going to the opposite extreme and denying the necessity of good works.

Goodsir, a clergyman of the Established Church of Scotland, declares: "It is impossible to get rid of the fact that there is in this dogma an insoluble puzzle, paradox, or contradiction and that one of its contradictory propositions is armed in a logical

sense with an irresistible antinomian force." The dogma he is speaking of is that of justification by faith alone.

The same writer says: "Absolutely every reason and motive proving the necessity for entering on a new life and living in obedience to the commandment of the Lord, is flatly contradicted by the explicit statement of the doctrine of justification or salvation set forth authoritatively in the Westminster Confession of Faith."

Concerning our own symbol he uses the following language: "It came clearly into view in my examination of the Augsburg Confession that a most disastrous collision between justification or salvation and the Divine commands enjoining righteousness and holiness, is the direct and inevitable result of making the great gospel benefit a purely external or imputative, as well as a purely gratuitous thing. For whereas the divine commands promulgated by the Gospel declare that repentance, regeneration, righteousness and holiness are necessary in order to the reaching and enjoying of eternal life, this is flatly contradicted by the declaration that these graces are neither elements of justification or salvation, for it is external or imputative; nor conditions of justification or salvation, for it is as well gratuitous, as the undoubted ground or title for the attainment and enjoyment of eternal life." The objection of this writer to the confessions mentioned, is, in short, the following: from the idea of justification, that of sanctification is absolutely excluded, and then whatever there is left in it is bestowed gratuitously, or, which is the same thing, unconditionally, or, at the most upon condition of a mere instrumental faith from which, in like manner, every moral quality has been carefully eliminated. And yet the effect of such a justification thus bestowed is nothing less than forgiveness of sin and a title to everlasting life and all accomplished without the the need of any sanctifying element in the justification bestowed or any moral virtue in the faith through which alone it is received. Verily, this does look as though at last we had found a way of salvation without being obliged to give up sin—a way of getting into the kingdom of heaven without any change in our moral character.

Bishop Jebb and Alexander Knox, a layman, of the Angli-

can church," regard justification by faith as a mere notion or cold abstraction, and therefore a nonentity. They then infer that as a notion it can have no effect upon the heart, no moral influence on the mind and conduct. To remedy this defect they propose to adopt the Romish expedient of confounding justification with sanctification." Such is substantially the account of the *Christian Observer* of (the views of) these two friends in their correspondence with each other. This is, in general, also the view of the Tractarians, as Bishop McIlvain has demonstrated in his excellent work on Righteousness by Faith, in which he proves that the Oxford divinity was very largely the development of rudimental principles set forth in Knox's "Remains."

Prof. Ritschl of the University of Göttingen in his able work on justification and reconciliation regards the attempt of Protestant writers to show that the faith which justifies involves also the ability and the inclination to well doing as a failure—thus leaving a missing link between justification and obedience. Of Zwingli's definition that saving faith is at the same time the disposition to perform good works, he says: "the combination is merely asserted but not vindicated." Prof. Ritschl, it must be remembered, is not a Catholic theologian.

Dr. Godet, professor of Theology in Neuchatel, and the author of many most thoughtful and helpful books, also a Protestant, expresses himself as follows on the subject under consideration: "Protestantism, we must confess, has always shown itself weak and embarrassed, when called upon to point out precisely the organic connection between these two elements of salvation—forgiveness and holiness. Theologians of this way of thinking have generally looked for this connection in the feeling of gratitude, or else have contented themselves with simply adding on the exposition of the law to that of grace, without seeking to discover the inner relation which connects the latter with faith and the former with obedience." The juxtaposition he judges insufficient and the feeling of gratitude does not constitute a proper foundation for the duty of Christian sanctification.

Beard, in the Hibbard Lectures for 1883 on the "Reformation

in its relation to Modern Thought and Knowledge," declares that antinomianism follows logically from a hard and external interpretation of justification by faith."

Swedenborg, himself the son of a Lutheran bishop of Sweden, gives it as his decided conviction that the doctrine of justification by faith is subversive of morality and extremely pernicious to all practical Christianity, and, accordingly, in his "True Christian Religion" he opposes it with all his power, in season and out of season. He assures us, on the authority of an angel, that those who embrace the doctrine here are doomed to take up their abode hereafter in a desert in which there is no grass, whilst those who rely on both faith and charity are permitted to dwell with the angels. And he further informs us that as the result of his own persistent efforts with him, Luther himself has become convinced that his favorite doctrine had been taken, not from the word of God, but from his own intelligence, that he frequently laughs at his former dogmas as diametrically opposed to the Bible, and, admitting that he seized upon the idea of faith to break away from the Catholics, wonders however how one crazy man could make so many others crazy so that they could not see that the Scriptures were against his doctrine.

Of course if this testimony is to be admitted against us, if it must be conceded that our heroic leader, who while on earth feared neither devils nor flames, has struck the flag, and if residence in a monotonous, grassless plain is the just award of heaven to such as hold this doctrine, then it is all up with justification by faith alone. But when we remember that this same witness also testified that the Christian Church had come to an end on the 19th of June, 1770, and that information to that effect had been sent out by Christ himself to the whole spiritual world, and that a new church should be raised up among the Gentiles, there is some hope that his testimony against Lutherans may be ruled out.

A stronger argument, however, against the moral effects of our doctrine than that brought from the regions visited by this wonderful dreamer, is involved in the well established fact that many of the staunchest and most devoted friends of justification

felt and acted on the conviction that there ought to be some modification in the form of its expression. Thus, for example, Osiander proposed to include sanctification as an element in justification. Melancthon, Major, Menius and others wished to guard the doctrine as ordinarily stated, by the declaration that good works, whilst not necessary to justification, were necessary to salvation. Others, while adhering to the approved mode of expression, sought to prevent antinomian consequences by extending the meaning of faith so as to make it really equivalent to faith and works. Such was the course advocated by Lauterwald of Upper Austria and Bishop Bull of England. The same desire for a qualified statement of this important doctrine manifested itself among English Protestants. J. T. Goodsir, of the National Church of Scotland formerly, makes the declaration that for a period of a hundred and twenty-five years, to the adoption of the Westminster Confession of Faith in 1646, "controversies were caused in the Protestant world by the collision between an external and gratuitous justification and the moral requirements of revealed religion, and that it was urged in these controversies that righteousness and holiness were not merely necessary, but necessary either as elements or conditions of justification and consequently necessary to the enjoyment of eternal life."

But even after the settlement of the controversy in favor of an unconditional justification by the adoption of the Westminster Confession, and especially its eleventh chapter, the desire for a change or qualification continued to manifest itself, and in about seventy-five years afterwards was influential enough in the Assemblies of the Church of Scotland of 1720 and 1722 to pass an act declaring "good works to be necessary to everlasting salvation;" thus materially modifying the doctrine of justification by faith alone, as well as diminishing its influence indefinitely. Now, as already remarked, this persistent agitation in favor of some more guarded statement seems plainly to denote that in the judgment of many of its most faithful friends the doctrine of justification in its present form was easily susceptible of such interpretation as to lend encouragement to evil doers to continue in their sinful course.

Having now set forth the nature of the charge brought against us, with sufficient minuteness and fullness to enable us to understand definitely what the accusation involves and also to appreciate the force thereof, let us next proceed to inquire what defence may be set up against the indictment preferred.

THE DEFENCE.

Our article unhesitatingly declares the charge to be false and promptly and energetically goes on to justify itself for pleading not guilty.

The writings of the accused are summoned to prove that useful instruction has been imparted in regard to the duties of men in the various relations of life; and that this instruction has even had the happy effect of bringing about a decided improvement in the preaching of the adversaries, causing them to say less about the childish and unprofitable things before discussed and more about faith.

Next there follows a re-statement of the doctrine assailed and a confirmation of the same from the Scriptures and the Fathers.

Then there is given a full definition of the faith to which justification is ascribed. This is felt to be a vital point in the defence. For if faith be merely a belief that what is revealed in the Scriptures is true, then it would indeed become a most difficult thing to maintain that the faith which justifies does also sanctify. But faith has an element beyond belief, viz. "trust which comforts and lifts up disquieted minds."

After this comes an explanation as to the manner in which faith produces good works. By faith the Holy Spirit is received; by the Holy Spirit the heart is renewed and new affections are begotten, the fruit of all which is the very thing we are accused of prohibiting—viz. good works.

The line of defence thus adopted by our Confessors is in every respect admirable, having unquestionably been based upon and suggested by, an experimental knowledge of the workings of faith as observed in their own hearts and lives. We shall use the long-tried weapons laid up in this arsenal of truth in attempting to resist the attack upon the faith delivered to us by these faithful soldiers of the cross.

The portion of our article which consists in a re-statement and confirmation of the doctrine of justification need not be dwelt upon in this discourse, it being sufficient to refer the reader to the able and satisfactory discussion thereof in the Holman Lecture on the fourth article of the Augsburg Confession, published in the October number of the *EVANGELICAL QUARTERLY REVIEW* for 1869. The design and advantage of its introduction into this article must not, however, by any means be passed by without due consideration; for it is inserted here as part of the answer to the charge stated at the beginning and involves a most important argument in our favor. They mean to say, we can show that our doctrine concerning faith is taught in the Scriptures and being a Scripture truth it cannot possibly give encouragement to evil doing nor prove a hindrance to works of righteousness and holiness. Having established it as a doctrine from God, we can say it is holy, just and good; and if in any case it is claimed that that which is good was made death to any one, we insist upon it that it was not the doctrine concerning faith that deceived and slew him, but, his own sins wrought death in him by that which itself is good. Whatever is done, therefore, to show that this doctrine as held and expounded by our Church is derived from the Scriptures is so much done to vindicate it and us from the charge of forbidding good works. For if the fact that justification hinders good works is proof that justification is not true, then also the fact that the doctrine is true, becomes proof that it is not and cannot be detrimental to the cause of morality.

The other arguments contained in our article will all be made use of at the proper time, in our answer to the charge to which our Confessors refused to plead guilty.

Believing that all the evidence furnished by our adversaries to substantiate the charge they have made, is contained in the three propositions mentioned near the beginning of this lecture, we shall proceed to consider these and in the order in which they were before enumerated, .

The first of these is an argument from the character of the professors of any particular doctrine to the character of the doctrine itself, or from the character of the effect to that of the

cause. The doctrine of justification by faith alone, it is maintained, must be immoral and false because the manners and lives of those who have embraced it are corrupt and ungodly.

In replying to this, let us first hear the answer Bishop Davenant gives to this objection as made by cardinal Bellarmine: "What frivolous arguing! Many Lutherans live wickedly, therefore Luther denied the necessity of good works. As if many Papists, many cardinals, yea Roman Pontiffs did not live very wickedly, although the necessity of good works is by no means denied in the Roman Church. * * * And lastly what outstrips all the folly is that a Romanist should infer error of doctrine from corrupt manners; a process of reasoning by which Rome herself, the chief seat of all wickedness (as all the world can testify) must be concluded to be herself the very sink of all errors." It is certainly not going beyond the truth to say with Owen that "those who at present oppose this doctrine do not in holiness, or righteousness, in the exercise of faith, love, zeal, self-denial and all other Christian graces, surpass those who adhere to it;" or with Bishop O'Brien that "this doctrine has no reason to fear the result of a comparison of what those who hold it have been enabled to do and to suffer in the cause of Christ, with any sacrifices or any labors which have been the fruits of any other view of the gospel."

And that a very considerable portion of Catholics are far from being worthy to have their names appear in the calendar of saints, is evident from admissions by Catholic writers themselves. Dr. Milner, for example, an able controversialist of the Church of Rome, writes as follows in his "End of Controversy": "I, as well as Baronius, Bellarmine, and other Catholic writers, have unequivocally admitted that some few of our pontiffs have disgraced themselves by their crimes and given just cause of scandal to Christendom. I acknowledge with the same unservedness that the lives of very many Catholics in this and in other parts of the Church are a disgrace to that Holy Catholic Church which they profess to believe in—unhappy members of the true religion by whom the name of God is blasphemed among the nations."

Now from this frank acknowledgment it appears that the lives of those who adhere to the supposed true faith are, to say the least, no better than those of the members of the Protestant Church. If, therefore, the Lutheran view of justification is false and immoral because the lives of many of its adherents are sinful, then it follows likewise that the Catholic view is false and immoral, for the lives of its adherents are corrupt likewise. Accordingly, there is neither justification by faith without works, nor justification by faith with works. This of course is an absurdity and so is the argument that leads to it.

But besides its being absurd, necessitating a conclusion known to be false, the argument is also impracticable and therefore without value. In the case of the persons whose immoral lives are to prove the immoral effects of justification, it must certainly be shown that they had indeed actually embraced the doctrine taught by Luther; not merely that they had in swarms renounced the Catholic faith, and professed the Lutheran, but that they had from the heart and with a correct understanding, adopted the same. The establishment of this single fact in the case before us is by no means a simple matter when the peculiar circumstances of the period referred to are taken into consideration; and yet the demand that the fact be established is just as reasonable as the demand, that before the death of any individual be charged to the mal-practice of a certain physician, it should be shown that the deceased had actually been under his treatment and had made use of his prescriptions.

Then again after having shown the co-existence of belief in Luther's theory of salvation and general corruption of manners in the same subjects, it ought to be made to appear that the corruption was really produced by their belief and not by any one of the many other causes that give rise to it. And when it is remembered that the neglect of good works complained of is found where no theory whatever as to the way of salvation has been adopted; yea, even where the Catholic view itself is held, it can readily be seen that it is a matter of extreme difficulty by any mere process of reasoning to show to a certainty that the persons referred to by Bellarmine would have lived better lives had they not come under the influence of Luther's doctrine con-

cerning justification. On account of the difficulties involved in this method of argument by deduction, it becomes simply impracticable and therefore useless. If the connection between belief in justification as taught by the Lutheran Church and disregard for the requirements of the moral law can be established at all, it must be done in some other way than the one now under consideration. The only effectual method, in fact, of arguing from the conduct of the adherents to a certain faith against the faith itself, is by the process of induction. Cases must be adduced of persons or communities that before adopting said faith were living in obedience to the will of God but afterwards manifested a total disregard of the same.

Now this very thing is attempted to be done in the work by Dr. Döllinger on the "Reformation as to its interior Development and Effects," as may be seen in the extracts taken from it by the *Dublin Review* for Sept. 1848 and inserted in Spalding's History of the Reformation. By means of exclusively Protestant testimony it is claimed that the people of Germany in general, who under Catholic influence had been virtuous and pious, became licentious and ungodly to an unusual degree upon adopting the Protestant faith. Luther declares that nowadays men are more corrupt, covetous, hard-hearted, licentious and wicked than under the papacy. * * * Our evangelicals are sevenfold more wicked than before. Melancthon says, that never in the days of our fathers had there existed such gluttony as now. Althamer writes: "Nobody cares to instruct his child, his servant, his maid or any of his dependants, in the word of God, or his fear. And thus our young generation is the worst that ever existed." It is further claimed that the testimonies gathered from Protestant documents describe the social condition not only of a portion of Germany under the Reformation, but of the country in general, specially naming the following: Saxony, Hesse, Nassau, Brandenburg, Strasburg, Nuremberg, Stralsund, Thorn, Mecklenburg, Westphalia, Pomerania, Friesland, Denmark and Sweden.

It is further asserted that "districts in which crimes were unknown were scarcely initiated in the principles of the Reforma-

tion till they became corrupted to the heart's core." Ditmarssen in Holstein is cited as a remarkable instance.

The universities are declared to have become more corrupt after the Reformation than before, being pronounced by Protestants themselves "asylums of dishonesty and vice," and "dens of immorality to which parents feared to send their children." And from Wolfgang Menzel, Spalding shows that the imperial court of Vienna afforded by its dignity and morality a bright contrast to the majority of Protestant courts.

Now here we are furnished with a fearful array of evidence, gathered exclusively from Protestant sources, which seems abundantly sufficient to prove the immoral effects of the Reformation of the 16th century. Admitting, as I suppose we must, that the state of things in Germany is correctly represented in this testimony, do the facts furnished necessitate the conclusion our opponents draw therefrom in regard to the tendency of the Protestant faith? We maintain they do not, and for the following reasons.

The facts relied on to verify their theory are taken from too narrow a strip of the entire field of investigation to justify a conclusion as to the character of the whole. True, this at first glance does not seem to be the case, inasmuch as the testimony is taken from common life, from life in the universities and at the courts of the nobles and of the reigning princes; not from one section of Germany merely but from no less than fourteen different countries which are specifically enumerated; not from one institution of learning only but from all; not from one Protestant court but from the majority of them. This certainly does look as though the experiments were sufficiently varied and general to justify the conclusion that what was true in so many cases must be true in all, or at all events, in the majority of cases, and reveal the existence of a law to the effect that the adoption of the doctrine of justification by faith is followed by the neglect of God's commandments.

Nevertheless, on closer examination it will be found that, in spite of the long list of particulars, the experiment is really but one—made on one people, one country, one period and one general condition of things. The people examined, whether taken

from the court, the university, the field or the shop, from German or Scandinavian lands, all belong to one common family—the Gothic.

The time in which the experiment is made is the remarkable period of transition from the bondage of the papacy to the freedom of the Gospel. This one circumstance, that the numerous facts adduced are supplied by one people subject to one common influence goes very far toward overthrowing the whole argument based upon the evidence so laboriously collected by Dr. Döllinger in his *History of the Reformation*.

Then again the testimony of the facts is not uniformly in favor of the theory to be proved even in the one period and country from which they were obtained; for it is a truth beyond question that among those who professed the new faith there were found many most godly men and women whose holy and devoted lives reflected great credit on the religion they had embraced. This is a second circumstance calculated to vitiate the argument we are examining.

And when the experiment is made, as it must be to have any value, in other nations and in other periods it will be found that there are many instances in which countries adopting the Protestant faith were not only improved thereby but attained to a moral and religious condition not easily paralleled in the best Roman Catholic country in the world. This, with the other considerations presented, is enough completely to overthrow the argument by induction from experiments made "in the circle of the Lutheran Confessions," and to prove beyond a doubt that whatever the facts may signify, they do not serve to establish it as a general truth, that the acceptance of the doctrine of justification by faith alone results in neglect of the law of God. They really, formidable as they appear from their number and character, prove nothing more than that the introduction of the Reformation with the various countries of Germany was accompanied by an apparent deterioration of the public morals; and this result can be most satisfactorily accounted for by the peculiar circumstances under which the Reformation was brought about, without any admissions derogatory to the moral tendency

of the glorious doctrine which our Church has the honor to have given back again to the world.

The circumstances we refer to as accounting for the facts adduced by Dr. Döllinger are the following.

The long forgotten truth which Luther was raised up to set forth and defend is one of the things of the Spirit of God which the natural man cannot receive because spiritual discernment is required; a doctrine to the reception of which a genuine inner religious experience is essential.

Besides, it had to be set forth in terms peculiarly liable to be misunderstood.

Mr. Beard in the Hibbert Lectures for 1883 well says: "All the words to which faith answers, have in different proportions an intellectual and a moral side. On one side they rise into 'trust' and imply a personal affection; on the other they sink into 'belief' and may mean no more than an intellectual assent. But unhappily 'glaube' alone covers the whole ground. It is faith and belief too." On this account justification by faith may very readily be taken to mean no more than justification by belief, which, as any one can perceive, is a very different thing from what Luther maintained.

Again, many of the teachers of this doctrine were not competent to exhibit it with the clearness and correctness necessary to a proper apprehension of it on the part of the hearers. "Most of the preachers," writes Bucer, "imagine that if they inveigh stoutly against the anti-Christians (the Papists) and chatter away on a few unimportant fruitless questions and then assailed their brethren also they have discharged their duty admirably." Seckendorf assures us that some preached of nothing but forgiveness and faith, neglecting the doctrine concerning sanctification and good works, and thus weakened the desire of holiness. Ledderhose in his life of Melancthon informs us that Melancthon was commissioned to prepare a manual of instructions for the ministers in the Electorate of Saxony. The very fact of such a work being ordered, as well as the instructions given in the same, show clearly that the teachers themselves needed to be taught. This is a second circumstance that

must be considered in accounting for the exceptional moral effects attending the first introduction of the Reformation.

And lastly, this highly spiritual doctrine, to a great extent entrusted as a matter of necessity to men poorly fitted to teach it, was to be lodged in the understandings and brought to bear upon the lives of a people still less prepared to receive it. Luther complained of the condition of things in Saxony: "Help, dear Lord, what frequent distress have I seen, because the common people, particularly in villages, know nothing at all of Christian doctrine, and it is but too true that many ministers are unskilful and unfit to teach. And yet all are called Christians, are baptized, and enjoy the holy sacraments, and do not even know the Lord's Prayer, or the Creed, or the Ten Commandments, and live on like the brutes."

Melanchthon often went out and wept, as he writes himself: "What can be offered in justification, that these poor people have hitherto been left in such great ignorance and stupidity. My heart bleeds when I regard this misery. Often when we have completed the visitation of a place I go to one side and pour forth my distress in tears. And who would not mourn to see the faculties of man so utterly neglected, and that his soul, which is able to learn and grasp so much, does not even know anything of its Creator and Lord." Seckendorf, as quoted by Hare, declares "that through the sloth or unfaithfulness of their priests before Luther began to preach, the great body of the common people were kept in ignorance of religion and merely urged to a servile observance of ceremonies." That most of them were so rude "as not even to recognize enormous sins to be such, nor have any thought of avoiding them, being accustomed to rely upon the outward expiations hitherto practiced, by means of confession and ecclesiastical satisfactions."

Now take all together: a doctrine requiring a true knowledge of self and of the Saviour of mankind, is to be taught by men in many cases ill-fitted for the work, to a people such as described by the testimony above given, and what conception is it likely that they would form in the main of the grand truth whereby the world was to be made glad. Uninformed and undisciplined in mind, ignorant of the most essential parts of God's

word, morally so abased as almost to have lost the very power of discriminating between right and wrong in the clearest instances, accustomed to a method of forgiveness after sinning which instead of regarding amendment of life as at all essential made light of it and attached all importance to mere outward observances, such as confessions, repeating *Pater Nosters*, fastings, bodily mortification and other mere external ceremonies, is it to be wondered at that people in such a case would by a free justification understand their former doctrine of penance to be meant with the penance left out; or in other words, that they would conceive Luther's doctrine to denote that they could sin as before and be spared the trouble besides of making confession to a priest and submitting to the penalties imposed by him. The practical effect of such a view by such a people would in all likelihood be a state of things very much like that depicted by Dr. Döllinger's plain-spoken and faithful witnesses. Not to the legitimate effect of the soul-comforting doctrine of justification by faith in Christ, but to the degraded intellectual and moral condition of the people to whom it was proclaimed, must the results complained of be attributed—a condition of things that Luther and the Reformation inherited, but did not create.

We have thus far proceeded on the supposition that the fact asserted by our opponents in respects to the superior moral condition of the German people before the Reformation was correct—a supposition absolutely essential to their argument—and yet have been able, as we think, to make it appear that, granting what they assert, their testimony does not prove our doctrine guilty of prohibiting good works. But we honestly believe that too much was admitted; that notwithstanding appearances the people in reality were just as corrupt before the Reformation as after it. Like an unruly son held in check by the strong hand of a determined father, the masses were restrained in a measure from overt acts of sin by penances, purgatory, and hell; but as soon as the fear of these things was taken away they acted out the evil nature in them without let or hindrance, just as the morally uncultured boy referred to gives free reins to his untamed passions the moment he leaves the parental home for college. In both cases there seems to be

a change for the worse, but the change is only apparent; they were not saints before nor afterwards. In the case of Saxony the testimony we have produced before shows that its moral condition was as low as it could well be conceived to be. In respect to Ditmarsen, a district in Holstein, it is claimed that it was remarkably free from certain crimes before the Catholic religion was abolished in 1532, but that in less than ten years after "public crimes prevailed so universally that neither preaching, teaching, instruction, menaces, nor the terror of God's wrath and his righteous judgment was of any avail." Now will any man in his senses believe that if these people had been as harmless and pious as represented they would so soon thereafter have become so fearfully corrupt. Verily it requires a total renunciation of the doctrine of the perseverance of the saints to accept a claim like this. And what we have good reason to believe as to Saxony and the district in Holstein specially singled out, is no doubt true also in regard to the other countries of Germany and Scandinavia—they were fully as bad in reality before their conversion to Protestantism as afterwards, and we feel sure that if Catholic writers had been as frank as ours were in describing the moral condition of their people it would not have required the indefatigable application of a Döllinger to have collected a mass of evidence from their own writings equal in all respects to that contained in the famous work on the Inner Development of the Reformation. The true verdict to be given in the case under consideration we believe to be that drawn up by Beard in the Hibbert Lectures in a note at the end of his fourth chapter, where in commenting on Dr. Döllinger's work he speaks as follows: "Again in a certain way the Reformation inherited the sins of the preceding age. It arose in part out of the dissolution of morals in which mediæval Christianity had ended and with which it had more or less successfully to cope. May not the worst that can truly be said of it be, that it had to deal with a corrupt generation and left it little better than it found it? The monasteries were full of monks and nuns, without vocation, who embraced Protestantism for the sake of the liberty which it offered them, and were afterwards

its disgrace." Or in other words, many of the converts to the new doctrine who had been left in a fearfully corrupt moral condition by the religion under which they had been reared are afterwards made to furnish evidence by their unimproved morals against the faith they have professed but whose transforming power they have not experienced.

Having now disposed of the objection to our faith based upon the character of its adherents, let us see what force there is in their second charge which accuses Protestants of favoring immorality by their direct and express teachings.

So far is this from being the fact that the very opposite is the case. Our confessors in the article under consideration refer to their writings on the Ten Commandments as proof of the useful instruction imparted by them in respect to the various Christian relations, duties and works. In the article itself they say with the utmost plainness that good works should and must be done. A separate article—the sixth—is introduced into the Augsburg Confession setting forth the necessity of good works as the fruits of faith. The works of Luther and Melancthon abound in passages enjoining obedience to the precepts of God's word. "Both subjects," says Luther, "even faith and works, ought to be diligently taught and urged. For if works alone are taught, as is the case in the papacy, faith is lost sight of; if faith alone is taught, immediately carnal men imagine that good works are not necessary." Archdeacon Hare regards Luther's concluding remarks on the Ten Commandments in the Larger Catechism as in themselves a sufficient answer to the charges of antinomianism made in Hallam's *Literature of Europe*. The passage quoted by Mr. Hare sets forth the superior excellence of the commandments with great force and beauty. Ranke's admirable words also deserve a place in this connection: "It is in this that Luther seeks his chief glory, in applying the principles of the gospel to common life. More especially did he deem himself bound to instruct the various classes of society—the magistrates and those under authority, fathers and other members of families—concerning their duties from a religious point of view. He displays an incomparable talent for popular teaching. He directs the parsons how they are to preach so as

to edify the common people—the schoolmasters how they are to instruct the young in the several stages, to combine secular knowledge with religion, to avoid all exaggeration,—the masters of families how they are to train their households in the fear of God. He draws up a series of texts to guide all in right living, the clergy and the laity, men and women, parents and children, servants and maids, young and old. He gives them a form for blessing and grace at table, for morning and evening prayer. He is the patriarch of the severe and devout domestic discipline and manners of the families in Northern Germany."

Equally decided as that of Luther, is the testimony borne by Melanchthon, by Chemnitz and many others in behalf of the importance and obligation of obedience to the moral law. Osiander, himself a Lutheran theologian, entertained the idea that according to Melanchthon and others God justified the believer without making any change in their moral condition. This charge was repudiated by his opponents, who denied that by justification they intended such a judgment passed by God upon the sinner as leaves him inwardly unchanged. They affirmed, on the other hand, that with the declaration that the believer is righteous is immediately connected the working of the Holy Spirit toward illumination, renovation and new obedience. They also pointed out to Osiander that they maintained, as a result of God's sentence of justification, a real union of Christ and the Holy Spirit with the believer. Such is the account Prof. Ritschl gives of the difference between Osiander and Melanchthon on the subject of justification.

In addition to this testimony of leading individuals, we have the evidence of our confessional writings as to what was taught in our churches on the subject of good works. The Augsburg Confession in article sixth says: "Also they teach that this faith should bring forth good fruits and that men ought to do the good works commanded of God, because it is God's will." "We should and must do good works," says the Apology, because God requires them: they are the fruits of faith." The Formula of Concord declares: "We believe, teach and confess that all men, but especially those who are regenerated and renewed by the Holy Ghost, are under obligation to do good works * *

* * Faith is first enkindled in us by the Holy Ghost in conversion, though the hearing of the gospel. This faith apprehends the grace of God in Christ, through which the individual is justified. Afterward, he is also renewed and sanctified by the Holy Ghost. And after such renewal and sanctification the fruits or good works follow. This is not to be understood as if justification and renewal are separated from each other, so that true faith can sometimes exist in connection with an evil design for a season; but here the order alone is exhibited according to which the one precedes or succeeds the other." Mœhler, the Catholic author of "Symbolism," admits that there is another side to the Lutheran principles of faith whereby it becomes the fruitful mother of love and good works. Bossuet, another Catholic divine, also acknowledges: "Luther did not exclude from justification a sincere repentance, namely—the horror of sin and the will to do good and, in short, the conversion of the heart—and judged it as absurd as we do to be justified without contrition or repentance."

Now from the the foregoing extracts it is evident that the general tone and spirit of Protestant writers is decidedly favorable to morality and holiness: and knowing their general intention to be to commend and encourage the cause of righteousness, we can feel sure that if any passages are found in any of their writings of an opposite character they must be capable of an interpretation consistent both with true morality and sound doctrine; or, if there is a real departure from the truth it must be regarded not as a wilful sin on their part, but one of infirmity, such as any man, however advanced in the divine life, is liable to commit. In regard to the passages commonly cited to show that Luther and Melancthon maintained sentiments immoral in themselves, and therefore necessarily promotive of vice, it will be found on due examination that there is nothing in them to warrant the unfavorable conclusion often drawn therefrom.

Bellarmino, as we have already seen in the former part of this lecture, criticises the following sentence from Luther's treatise on Christian Liberty: "Good works do not make a man good, nor bad ones make him bad." That this expression, properly

understood, contains no error but a most important truth can be seen at a glance by any unprejudiced mind. The correctness of this judgment will appear quite readily when the whole passage of which it forms a part, is examined. It is found in Luther's Primary Works, recently issued by the Lutheran Publication Society, on page 121, and reads as follows: "A bishop when he consecrates a church, confirms children, or performs any other duty of his office, is not consecrated as bishop by these works; nay, unless he had been previously consecrated as bishop, not one of these works would have any validity; they would be foolish, childish and ridiculous. Thus a Christian, being consecrated by his faith, does good works; but, he is not by these works made a more sacred person, or more a Christian. That is the effect of faith alone; nay, unless he were previously a believer and a Christian, none of his works would have any value at all; they would really be impious and damnable sins. True, then, are these two sayings; good works do not make a man good, but a good man does good works. Bad works do not make a man bad, but a bad man does bad works. Thus it is always necessary that the substance or person should be good before any good works can be done and that good works should follow and proceed from a good person. As Christ says, a good tree cannot bring forth evil fruit, neither can a corrupt tree bring forth good fruit. * * * As then trees must exist before their fruit and as the fruit does not make the tree either good or bad, but on the contrary a tree of either kind produces fruit of the same kind; so must first the person of the man be good or bad before he can do either a good or bad work; and his works do not make him bad or good but he himself makes his works either bad or good. We may see the same in all handicrafts. A bad or good house does not make a bad or good builder, but a good or bad builder makes a good or bad house. And in general, no work makes the workman such as it is itself; but the workman makes the work such as he is himself. Such is the case, too, with the works of men. Such as the man himself is, whether in faith or in unbelief, such is his work, good if it be done in faith, bad if in unbelief." Now in all this there certainly is nothing worthy of condemnation for it is but an ex-

hibition of the truth taught by Christ himself in Matthew 7 : 17, 18, that if any man would do the works commanded of God his first concern must be to be renewed in the spirit of his mind by the grace of Christ through the operation of the Holy Ghost. Yea, instead of being held up to the scorn of the world for uttering ungodly sentiments, Luther deserves no little praise for being able to enter so fully into the profound meaning of our Lord's deep saying and setting it forth so clearly and plainly. There is in it a world of wisdom and practical instruction for all who are concerned either to make themselves or others better. The world over, the first and instructive impulse is to begin at the wrong end in the improvement of character—by putting off the bad fruit and trying to force the production of good fruit. This holds good of ministers, teachers, parents and men in general; the great majority of laborers in the Master's vineyard are wasting time and effort in trying to do two impossible things—making corrupt trees bring forth good fruit and turning bad trees into good ones by first making them bear good fruit. Wise to win souls is the man who sees as Luther did, that good works do not make a man good, nor bad ones make him bad, and who consequently feels the absolute necessity of first committing every tree into the hands of the Lord of the vineyard to be transformed by the power of his might, regarding it as his great and chief business not to counsel men to attempt the impossible task of making themselves better by their own works, but to point them and urge them to the Lamb that taketh away the sin of the world.

Another saying of Luther's condemned by Bellarmine is this: "Where there is faith no sin can hurt." This same passage is quoted more fully for censure by Prof. Mœhler, and at still greater length by Nampon. Ward, an English writer, also harps on this same string. The passage is taken from Luther's treatise on the Babylonish Captivity and may be seen in the work already referred to, Wace's *Luther's Primary Works*, on page 185. The subject of which Luther is speaking is baptism, and his object is to persuade men when they have sinned to rely for forgiveness upon the promise of God made to them in their baptism, instead of depending upon any satisfactions they can per-

form themselves. His own words will best show his design as well as his meaning. "The first thing we have to notice in baptism is the divine promise which says, He who believes and is baptized shall be saved. This promise is to be infinitely preferred to the whole display of works, vows, religious orders and whatsoever has been introduced by the invention of man. On this promise depends our whole salvation and we must take heed to exercise faith in it, not doubting at all that we are saved, since we have been baptized. Unless this faith exists and is applied, baptism profits us nothing; nay it is hurtful to us, not only at the time when it is received but in the whole course of our after life. For unbelief of this kind charges the divine promise with falsehood, and to do this is the greatest of all sins." This promise, he goes on to say, ought to be studiously inculcated by preaching, because having been once conferred upon us its truth continues to the hour of death; the penitent's heart will be comforted and encouraged to hope for mercy if he fixes his eyes upon that divine promise once made to him, which could not lie, and which still continues entire, unchanged and unchangeable by any sins of his. And then, after illustrating his point by the case of the children of Israel, who when they returned to God in repentance first of all called to mind their deliverance from Egypt, he utters the sentiment censured by our opponents: "We see then how rich a Christian or baptized man is; since, even if he would, he cannot lose his salvation by any sins however great, unless he refuses to believe; for no sins whatever can condemn him but unbelief alone. All other sins, if faith in the divine promise made to the baptized man stands firm or is restored, are swallowed up in a moment through that same faith; yea, through the truth of God, because he cannot deny himself if thou confess him and believingly cleave to his promise. Whereas contrition, confession and satisfaction for sins and every effort that can be devised by men, will desert thee at thy need and make thee more miserable than ever, if thou forgettest this divine truth and puffest thyself up with such things as these. For whatever work is wrought apart from faith in the truth of God is vanity and vexation of spirit." The case that Luther has under consideration is that of a believer or bap-

tized person who has fallen into grievous sin since his baptism. How shall such a one obtain pardon and get back again the lost grace and the lost right to heaven? By the sacrament of penance, says the Church. The virtue of your baptism has come to an end by the sin you have committed; the ship of baptism is wrecked. Henceforth your only hope is in the plank of penance which the Church throws out to keep you from perishing. Or in other words, it has set up a tribunal on earth to dispose of the cases of persons sinning after baptism. The priest, as the appointed vicar of Christ, has full authority to try such cases, pronounce judgment, and determine the penalty. Before this tribunal of the Church every man who has sinned after baptism must appear, exercise contrition, confess his sins and perform the satisfaction imposed on him by his confessor. Otherwise there is no salvation. Now what Luther teaches in the passage objected to is diametrically opposed to all this and entirely subversive of this priestly court. When the Church says to the penitent seeking pardon, Do penance, Luther bids him exercise faith in the divine promise given him in his baptism. When the Church answers that the virtue of baptism has ceased, Luther declares, it continues till the hour of death. When the Church further argues, that one mortal sin is sufficient to annul the grace and salvation secured in baptism, Luther then insists on it that "a baptized person cannot, even if he would, lose his salvation by any sins however great, unless he refuses to believe, for no sins whatever can condemn him but unbelief alone. All other sins, if faith in the divine promise stands firm or is restored, are swallowed up in a moment through that same faith; yea through the truth of God, because he cannot deny himself, if thou confess him and believingly cleave to his promise." In short, Luther here teaches that sins after baptism are remitted in the same manner as those committed before—through faith in the promise of God in Christ; that the old ship has not been dashed to pieces as was supposed, but still sails safely on its course and need not be exchanged for one of the fragments into which it has been broken. Thus summarily does Luther turn this whole sacerdotal court out of doors by his doctrine concerning baptism, and it is not to be wondered at that the view

set forth and advocated by him should fail to find favor in the eyes of those whose jurisdiction is thus overthrown.

The third passage of Luther's that has often been employed to prove him guilty of favoring immorality by direct teaching, is that in which he seems to counsel and urge the commission of sin on the ground that however often and however greatly we may sin we yet shall not be separated thereby from the love of Christ; yea, even though a thousand fornications and murders were committed in a single day. This certainly seems to deserve the severe condemnation which it has so often received; yet as in the case of the other passages it admits of very satisfactory explanation. The expression is taken from a letter written by Luther to Melanchthon, a circumstance which at once puts the whole matter into a more favorable light. According to Hare, who bases his views upon Baur's reply to Mœhler, Luther, in the letter referred to, discusses the question whether the reception of the communion in one kind only is sinful. He expresses his gratification that at Wittenberg it is celebrated in both kinds as instituted by Christ. Then he goes on to speak of fearful calamities which appear to him to be hanging over Germany. Immediately after this occurs the passage that has given so much offence, in which Melanchthon is apparently urged to commit the most abominable crimes and with the utmost possible frequency, inasmuch as through the riches of God's grace they will all be forgiven. When it is borne in mind that, just before, Luther had expressed his apprehensions in regard to calamities that threatened his native land, we cannot suppose that, "unless some evil spirit had actually taken possession of him, he could just then have cried out to Melanchthon, Come, brother, let us sin, let us wallow in sin, so that our enemies may indeed have good reason to exult and triumph over us and that all lovers of godliness may be offended." The following paraphrase by Mr. Hare, we believe, sets forth the true meaning of this notorious passage, and we will therefore give it in his own words: "When we look back to the previous argument about the eucharist, it seems evident that Melanchthon must have been insisting on the sinfulness of receiving in one

kind. This, Luther speaks of as a *fictum peccatum*, and says: You who are a preacher of grace, remember that the grace you are to preach of is not a make-believe but a mighty reality and that it is not bestowed on us for the forgiveness of artificial peccadilloes, but of those awful, cleaving sins of which every man with an awakened conscience must acknowledge himself guilty. God sent his Son into the world to save real sinners—not fictitious sinners. Therefore be a sinner and sin boldly. Acknowledge that thou art a sinner, but be of a good heart notwithstanding. Do not torment thyself about peccadilloes; let not the consciousness of thy sins drive thee to despair; believe in Christ and rejoice in him who is the conqueror of sin, of death and of the world; and let this faith prevail over the consciousness of thy sins. We needs must sin as long as we are in our present state. This life is not the habitation of righteousness, but we look, St. Peter tells us, for a new heaven and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness. It is enough that through the riches of the glory of God we have known the Lamb that taketh away the sins of the world. From him sin shall not separate us, even though we committed fornication and murder a thousand times; yea a thousand times in a single day." Whether this explanation of Mr. Hare's be satisfactory to all or not, one thing is certain from the very force of the passage, and that is, that Luther does not mean to exhort any one to the commission of these crimes; and not any the less sure is it, that he does not mean to say that a believer can be guilty of these enormous sins and yet not be deprived of the fellowship of Christ. He undoubtedly aims to magnify the grace of God to the utmost possible extent. Having unlimited confidence in its efficacy, he assures us that nothing can be too hard for it. No matter how aggravated the sin, the grace of God can forgive and wash it away. And then supposing an extreme case, he declares that though one should be guilty of fornication and murder a thousand times in a single day, even such a sinner could be washed, sanctified and justified in the name of our Lord Jesus and by the spirit of our God. There is in this whole passage nothing whatever to alarm the friends of morality; it is the effort of a great soul struggling after language to express

the exalted conception it has formed of the Gospel of Christ; it is only Luther's way of saying, where sin aboundeth grace doth much more abound.

One other expression demands examination under the head of favoring immorality by direct teaching: it is the one asserting the necessity of good works to salvation. As shown in the former part of this lecture, our church was not willing to sanction the use of this formula, and for its rejection has received censure, as if opposed to that which is right and good. The unwillingness to tolerate this famous proposition, we believe, can be accounted for without being obliged to acknowledge that it indicates hostility to good works themselves. Let the object of their opposition be clearly distinguished. It is not good works that they objected to. On the contrary they insist on it that these are necessary and should be done; necessary for various reasons, but not for salvation in the sense in which the phrase was invariably understood in those days. The opposite proposition, that good works are pernicious to salvation they reject with the utmost promptness and emphasis, "because thereby discipline and decency are impaired and a barbarous, savage, secure, Epicurean life is introduced and strengthened." They give as a reason for not approving the expression under consideration: "That it is not in accord with the form of sound doctrine and with the word, and has been always and still is set over against our Christian faith by the Papists, in which we confess that faith alone justifies and saves."

Bishop Davenant makes the following sensible remarks upon this point: "In contending with the Romanists about justification it is not wise or safe to use or admit these propositions—that good works are necessary to salvation." And he assigns as a reason that, when they are nakedly propounded, the Papists always understand by them that works are necessary as being from their real and intrinsic worthiness meritorious causes of man's salvation, which is most false." He then goes on to point out various senses that may be given to this proposition that are not true, and on this account the formula in its unqualified form is to be rejected. The long and short of the matter is, that this proposition is susceptible of an interpretation and

an application that are erroneous and misleading. There are conditions and states of mind in religious experience in which the counsel involved in our formula would be unwise, impracticable, and calculated to lead to despondency and despair. Our Reformers were Augustinian, and not Pelagian or Semi-Pelagian, in their conceptions of the state of mankind since the fall. They did not merely regard man as stubborn and unwilling to do what he ought, but they also considered him as sick and helpless. They accordingly felt that what a man, unable to raise an arm for very weakness, needed, was not commands and incentives to quit his bed and go about and attempt the work of one in perfect health, but encouragement and admonition most urgent to commit himself at once, before doing another thing, into the hands of the good Physician who came to heal them that are sick. Persuaded of the folly and misery of dealing with a condemned and helpless sinner, as you would with a righteous holy being, they could not tolerate any utterance or teachings that put the halt, the blind, the sick and impotent to work to heal themselves by doing good work, and as this expression was always interpreted to mean that a sinner must save himself by his own working, they rightly and to the comfort of many troubled hearts rejected the proposition—not because they were opposed to good works, but to the consummate folly of setting a multitude of impotent folk to work to cure their impotency by vigorous exercise and labor, or as Luther has tersely put it, in his *Christian Liberty*: It is not from works that we are set free by the faith of Christ, but from the belief in works.

In concluding this portion of our subject let us call to mind the several facts that have now come into our possession: The Reformers expressed themselves with the utmost fullness and freeness upon the various subjects of religion, and what they spoke or wrote was proclaimed to the ends of the earth; out of all their numerous sayings and writings only a very small number of passages have ever been objected to on the ground of their discouraging virtue and promoting vice; these passages thus censured and condemned have been found not only to admit of a satisfactory explanation but of such interpretation as to be made to teach most precious and important truth. Now

when all these circumstances are considered, does it not seem miraculous that these men should not have offended more frequently and more decidedly, and do we not in this fact alone have proof conclusive that they knew from inner consciousness whereof they affirmed, and that they spake as they were taught and moved of the Holy Ghost.

We have now disposed of two of the arguments commonly relied on to prove that the Protestant faith prohibits good works; that based upon the lives of Protestants, and that drawn from the professed teachings of several of the leading Reformers.

The third and only one yet remaining to be examined is that based upon the natural tendency of the doctrine of a free justification, which tendency it is claimed is unavoidably antinomian. Men, it is urged, will have no motive to obey the precepts of God's word, when they are assured that without the deeds of the law they shall be justified and saved by faith alone.

The chief reasons assigned for charging our doctrine of justification with antinomian tendencies are the two following. The prominent external motives that constrain men to avoid wrong-doing and follow after righteousness are the threatening of punishment and the promise of reward, and the force of these is taken away by belief in the theory of faith advocated by our churches. These external influences being removed, internal impulse alone must be depended on to produce the conduct required by God's word. This, in the case of the consistent Protestant believer, must all come from his faith, for that is the only internal quality made necessary to justification; and this faith, it is confidently maintained, has no moral power in it at all adequate to the production of a righteous course of conduct. Accordingly, there being no force within or without to constrain to a life of obedience, man, left to himself, will naturally walk after the lusts of his unrenewed heart and continue in the ways of sin.

Let us look at these reasons in the order above given. The first is that the force of the punishments threatened against disobedience and of the rewards promised to righteousness, is annulled by the Protestant view of faith. The Protestant Christian is taught to believe that the moment he turns to God in

faith he obtains remission of sins, acceptance with God and a right to eternal life, not on account of anything he has done or can do himself, but solely on account of what Christ has done in his behalf. Thus from the first step toward the Father's house he may have hope and peace, instead of doubt and tormenting fear. The Catholic, on the other hand, is taught that he is not justified until, and in so far as, he is also sanctified. His justification, being based on his having been made inherently righteous, follows his sanctification; and as any man's obedience is always imperfect and doubtful, there is always more or less uncertainty as to his acceptance before God and his final salvation. This uncertainty, it is claimed, begets a wholesome fear, which acts as a continual restraint upon wrong-doing and an incentive to righteousness, whilst the Protestant's more confident and more cheerful view of his relation to God and eternal life has the opposite effect and renders him careless about his conduct. As Bishop Davenant says: "The Papists object that this doctrine of the assurance of faith, which we lay down, puts men at their ease, and that the effect is that men take occasion hence to give the reins more boldly to unholy lusts." Father Paul tells us that in the debates in the Council of Trent on the certainty of forgiveness and grace it was maintained that uncertainty was profitable and meritorious besides; that otherwise "a Christian would become drowsy, careless and negligent to do good."

Now in considering this objection it must be distinctly borne in mind that it can apply to none but believers, for none others are freed from the fear in question by our teaching on the subject of justification. According to our doctrine also, as well as that of our opponents, the fear of eternal condemnation can be brought to bear upon the minds of impenitent men to bring them to repentance and faith in the Lord Jesus Christ.

In further noticing the objection now before us we have the following considerations to present. That while disposed to admit that the threatening of punishment has a restraining effect upon wrong-doing under all circumstances, we nevertheless feel that the value of this motive to the cause of religion may very easily be overrated, and that when it is constantly present to the

consciousness or exists in a high degree, it actually hinders, and sometimes even paralyzes activity, instead of promoting or producing it. Prof. Wace in the Boyle Lectures for 1874-1875, in speaking of the doctrine of justification as favoring amendment of life, ascribes this result to the fact that the doctrine delivers men from fear and establishes confidence between the soul and God. He must have very different ideas as to the effects of fear on morality from the Tridentine theologians who pronounced it both profitable and meritorious. This is what he says on the subject: "If I have at all succeeded in explaining the meaning of the doctrine (justification), it will not seem wonderful that it should have such an influence. Its very object, as we have seen, is to remove from the soul every fear, to banish those shadows of guilt which render it timorous in action and in thought, and to restore it to perfect confidence in a just and an almighty God. This is the Protestantism which in the mouth of Luther, gave a new life to the world. The proclamation of the Reformer was that 'it is the design of God to have dauntless, calm, and generous sons, in all eternity and perfection, who fear absolutely nothing, but by confidence in his grace triumph over and despise all things, and treat punishments and deaths as sport. The rest He hates as cowards, who are confounded by the fear of everything, even by the sound of a rustling leaf.'"

Again, the facts of religious experience, as far as they bear upon the question under discussion, do not favor the view that uncertainty as to our acceptance with God is conducive to piety; for these facts indicate very clearly and decidedly that the stronger a man's conviction is that he is in favor with God and is in possession of the gift of grace, the stronger is his desire for holiness and the greater and steadier his effort to attain it.

The inspired writers, in appealing to men to cultivate holiness, evidently do not apprehend any unfavorable results from the assurance of faith. Thus the apostle exhorts the Corinthian Christians to cleanse themselves from all filthiness of the flesh and spirit because they have the promise that God would receive them and be a Father unto them. St. John uses the fact that we are sons of God now and shall be like him hereafter as a reason why every man should purify himself. St. Peter, hav-

ing first reminded his readers that the divine power has given them all things belonging to life and godliness, assures them these exceeding great and precious promises are given that by them we might become partakers of the divine nature. Now all these appeals are addressed, not to the feeling of fear begotten by our uncertainty as to our relation to God, but to the feeling of confidence produced by the conviction that God is truly our Father and that we are his children indeed.

The objection against the doctrine we are seeking to defend bears equally hard upon the blessed Gospel of the son of God, if the apostle Paul's representations as to its design are to be trusted. He declares in the epistle to the Hebrews that it was the purpose of Christ to destroy the devil who had the power of death, and deliver them who through fear of death were all their lifetime subject to bondage. In his epistle to the Romans he says: Ye have not received the spirit of bondage again to fear; but ye have received the spirit of adoption, whereby we cry, Abba, Father. How well this accords with Luther's expression, quoted by Wace: "It is the design of God to have dauntless, calm, and generous sons, who fear absolutely nothing, but by confidence in his grace triumph over and despise all things and treat deaths and punishments as sport."

Lastly, the faith through which the fear in consideration is cast out, itself calls into play other influences, which, to say the least, are fully as efficacious in preventing the believer from acting contrary to the will of God, as the uncertainty which our opponents pronounce so wholesome in its effects. The restraints referred to are the following, and their operations are so well understood that the bare enumeration of them is sufficient to our purpose. The conviction that God is ever near us and sees all we do; the desire to enjoy the esteem and good will of one so exalted in character and power as God; the fear of displeasing God and thus bringing upon ourselves his paternal chastisement; the fear of being deprived of the Holy Spirit's presence and assistance; the dread of the sense of guilt, shame and misery that sin produces; the aversion to the very nature of sin, and the doubt that any act of disobedience begets as to whether we are in the faith or not. These various motives to

righteous conduct, which faith calls into activity, will more than compensate for the loss sustained through the casting out of that fear that hath torment, and remove all occasion for uneasiness as to any injury the cause of morality and religion may suffer by its expulsion. All things considered, the fact that our faith delivers men from this slavish spirit should be regarded, not as an argument against our view of justification, but as satisfactory evidence in favor of its truth and excellence.

But, interpose our opponents, not only is the motive of fear counteracted by your doctrine of justification, but that of hope also. What is there to stir up a man to do his best in the cultivation of spiritual graces, or to stimulate him to zealous exertion in the service of Christ, in the case of a person who believes himself accepted of God and entitled to eternal glory in consideration of what another has done in his behalf? Does not faith break off the connection between our efforts here and our destiny hereafter, and thus rather impede than help in completing Christian character and performing Christian works. The argument is that the believer has no incentive to exertion in the attainment of holiness and in the rendering of service, inasmuch as admittance into heaven is not made to depend upon these things but upon the work and righteousness of Christ. The believer is supposed to say within himself, "since by faith in Jesus I am in possession of a title to heaven, it matters not whether I am diligent in the culture of my inner life and in the performance of duty or otherwise; the result is all the same in either case—it is a penny a day whatever the amount or character of the service rendered."

In examining this objection let us inquire whether it is a fact that, on the supposition that our right to heaven depends upon the work of Christ for us and not upon the merit of our own doings, a greater or less degree of fidelity and activity in the pursuit of moral excellence and the discharge of Christian obligation makes no difference in our future condition. We think it will turn out far otherwise. We feel assured that it can be made to appear from the word of God that the outward circumstances of the saved will differ very materially hereafter, even as

they are known to do in the present life. The Scriptures furnish various representations that indicate with much clearness that there are differences in external condition in heaven as well as upon earth. For instance, the apostle Paul in the 15th chapter of first Corinthians sets forth the great variety that exists in the objects of this world; all flesh is not the same flesh but differs in the case of men, of beasts, of fishes and of birds. So also there is a difference between celestial bodies and bodies terrestrial. The sun, moon and stars differ in glory; and again one star from another. Then he adds, "so also is the resurrection of the dead." The idea of the apostle seems to be that different kinds of nature take upon themselves different outward forms. The higher the nature the nobler the body assumed. And there is every reason to believe that what holds good in respect to the different kinds of nature is a law also in respect to different degrees of the same nature. The nobler the nature the nobler the external form in which it is clothed. Consequently the higher the degree of holiness—which is the sum of all moral excellence—the nobler and better the resurrection body. Superiority of inner life will express itself in superior external form. This is already of itself a difference in outward condition, for superior bodily excellence is an advantage by no means to be despised. But having reason to believe that hereafter there will be a perfect adjustment between the nature of all God's creatures and their external circumstances, we feel confident that superiority in outward condition may be inferred from superiority of character.

Still more decided and clear however is the evidence in support of this position furnished by the teachings of the Saviour in the parable of the pounds and of the talents. The parables in general reveal to us the unseen things of the Kingdom of Heaven by means of the known things of this world.

The Saviour, before whose eye both worlds lie equally open, tells us what he sees in the one by comparison with what we know in the other. The kingdom of heaven is like unto a man going into a far country who delivered his goods into the hands of his servants, directing them to trade therewith till his return. After a long time he cometh again and reckoneth with them.

Now let us see carefully on what principles he deals with them, for like him is the kingdom of heaven, or as this nobleman dealt with his servants so will the Saviour deal with his likewise. In the parable in the 25th of St. Matthew, that of the talents, the following are the facts given. One of the servants had received five talents; with these he traded and made therewith other five talents. The percentage of gain is exactly one hundred. The reward is commendation for fidelity and the assurance that he shall be made ruler over many things. Another servant has received only two talents; gains therewith two talents more. The percentage of increase is one hundred, the same as in the case of the first servant. The reward is precisely the same as in the former instance, expressed in precisely the same words. The reason undoubtedly is that the diligence and fidelity were exactly the same in both servants.

Now in St. Luke, the 19th chapter, we have the parable of the pounds very similar in many respects to that of the talents. Here all the servants are entrusted with a like amount—one pound. The first one reports a gain of ten pounds; the second of five or only half as much on the same capital. As the sum traded with is the same, there must have been twice the activity and faithfulness in the case of the first servant as in that of the second. Will there be any difference in the reward? or will the declaration of the Saviour be precisely the same to the second as the first, as we found it to be in the parable by St. Matthew. Read the 17th and the 19th verses, "Well, thou good servant; because thou hast been faithful in a very little, have thou authority over ten cities." That is what he said to him that gained ten pounds. "Be thou also over five cities," is what he said to him that had gained five pounds. Here is no word of commendation; he is not called good servant; he is not pronounced faithful, for that would not have been true as with precisely the same abilities and opportunities he ought to have accomplished as much as the first, with equal application. Now we for our part believe that the Saviour is not careless in the use of expressions and that the distinctions perceived in his language were designed by him, and designed because he wanted to teach mankind that reward in his kingdom would correspond with the ut-

most nicety to the degree of faithfulness manifested in his service.

Nor is there, as is commonly supposed, in the parable of the laborers who wrought different lengths of time but received the same compensation, anything to conflict with the teaching of the two we have considered. That only teaches this additional principle that the motives of the laborers, and their opportunities, are taken into consideration in fixing the rate of compensation and not merely the length of the service or the amount of work.

The following extract from Prof. Bruce's *Training of the Twelve* expresses the same truth, "The kingdom of glory will be but the kingdom of grace perfected, the regeneration begun here brought to its final and complete development. But the regeneration, in its imperfect state, is an attempt to organize men into a society based on the possession of spiritual life, all being included in the kingdom who are new creatures in Christ Jesus, and the highest place being assigned to those who have attained the highest stature as spiritual men. This ideal has never been more than approximately realized. The visible church, the product of the attempt to realize it, is and ever has been a most disappointing embodiment, in outward visible shape, of the ideal city of God. Ambition, selfishness, worldly wisdom, courtly arts, have too often procured thrones for false apostles, who never forsook anything for Christ. Therefore we still look forward and upward with longing eyes for the true city of God, which shall as far exceed our loftiest conceptions as the visible church comes short of them. In that ideal commonwealth perfect moral order will prevail. Every man shall be in his true place there; no vile men shall be in high places, no noble souls shall be doomed to obstruction, obscurity, and neglect; but the noblest will be the highest and first, even though now they be the lowest and last. 'There shall be true glory, where no one shall be praised by mistake or in flattery; true honor, which shall be denied to no one worthy, granted to no one unworthy; nor shall any unworthy one ambitiously seek it, where none but the worthy are permitted to be.'" The last sentence Prof. Bruce quotes from Augustine.

The argument is undoubtedly supported also by reason and experience. That men should be rewarded according to their excellence and works no unprejudiced mind will deny. That the qualities and actions of men have much to do in determining their outward circumstances in this world, is a matter of common observation. To a great extent every man makes his own surroundings, and similar causes will have like results always and everywhere.

But not only will there be differences in external condition, graduated according to the degree of moral character, but even under precisely the same outward circumstances the man that has made the greatest progress in holiness will enjoy the largest amount of satisfaction and of good.

Happiness is by no means proportioned to the means of happiness which our circumstances afford us, but depends very much also upon our own state of mind, and our dispositions. There are feelings and affections that will make happiness impossible under any circumstances however favorable, and there are others again that will keep the mind in a state of peace and joyfulness under the hardest external condition. Happiness accordingly comes very largely from within, and not exclusively from without. On this subject Chalmers says most excellently and truly: "Virtue is not the price of heaven—it is the very substance and being of heaven. * * * All who refuse a life of virtue, do in fact refuse the only heaven of eternity—the heaven of the New Testament; for search far and wide over all the domains of infinite space and there is positively no other heaven to be found than a heaven of righteousness and true holiness. Were it only a musical heaven, we ask of what use and enjoyment it could be to the deaf? or were it only a heaven of beauty and splendor, a panorama of glorious spectacles over which the delighted eye might expatiate, of what use could the privilege of entry into such a heaven be to the blind? or were it only an intellectual heaven, how could it prove a heaven at all to those bereft of understanding? or finally, being what it is, a moral and spiritual heaven, it can be no heaven to the wicked, or the secular, or the earthly; and that it might be a heaven to us there must be an adaptation of the subjective to the objec-

tive, or in plainer language we must be sanctified, we must be moralized."

Again, our ability to derive profit and enjoyment from any opportunities the providence of God may afford us, depends also upon the degree of cultivation bestowed upon the various faculties through which we perceive and appreciate the excellencies of the objects around us. A man's ability to derive pleasure from the beautiful, the grand, the sublime in nature, depends upon his taste for these glories of the world in which we live; one will be unaffected by the scene that thrills the soul of another with delight. A man's ability to derive enjoyment from the noblest productions of literature depends altogether upon his ability to apprehend and appreciate the thoughts and feelings that are expressed therein. The book, that one reader will thrust aside as dull and tedious, another will hang over with deepest interest and attention and lay aside with regret when finished. And thus it is with every means of rational enjoyment; he whose powers have been most highly disciplined by faithful exercise thereof will, other things being equal, derive the highest degree of pleasure and profit from any circumstances calculated to furnish these.

From these considerations it appears that the cultivation of all our various faculties, moral and intellectual, constitutes an important element in every man's happiness; and that the measure of cultivation of mind and heart becomes the measure of enjoyment and advantage that our external surroundings will yield. Now it can readily be shown that both character and mental culture are the product of our own actions while in a state of discipline here on earth; and that thus we ourselves create the constituent elements that enter into our happiness, here and hereafter.

And, first, moral character is the outgrowth of our daily conduct. Any desire, whether good or evil, that arises in the soul impels to action corresponding in character to that of the desire itself. If the desire, by the consent of the will, passes over into an outward act it gains strength by the gratification afforded. The act being continuously repeated, the desire becomes established as a habit or permanent disposition of the mind and

this is character. Now in the school of life it has been so ordered that demands are made almost hourly upon the virtuous feelings, as self-control, self-denial, forbearance, benevolence, zeal for God and many other Christian affections. According as we respond to these demands, gaining victories over evil dispositions and indolence, so we advance in moral character, and that, as before shown, is an important and essential element in happiness whether on earth or in heaven.

So also it is in respect to the improvement of all our mental powers; every pursuit in life calls them into play and the man that is most careful and faithful to put his whole soul into his work will acquire the highest degree of discipline. Faithful performance of any work, whatever, will involve the best use of all the intellectual faculties we possess, and such use will always bring with it increased power of the kind that was called into activity. The man, consequently, who employs his gifts most faithfully on all occasions that require their exercise, is the man in whom these will become most fully developed, and superior development always enables him to derive greater satisfaction and benefit from any circumstances in which he may be placed. He that hath, to him shall be given, and he shall have more abundantly.

Summing up our argument, then, we find, that in the future life our external condition will be pleasant and profitable in a higher or lower degree in proportion as we have attained to a higher or lower degree of excellence of character, and have manifested greater or less zeal and fidelity in the service of God; likewise, that even out of the same circumstances we shall be able to derive more or less of enjoyment and advantage according as our moral and intellectual faculties have been more or less improved by cultivation; and lastly that the degree of moral and intellectual development we attain depends upon the manner in which we discharge the duties of every day life, and the use we make of the opportunities for self-discipline with which God continually surrounds us. In short, happiness corresponds with character, and character is the product of fidelity in respect to opportunity and duty. Thus, after all, even on the admission that our works do not purchase a right to heaven, it turns

out that our reward hereafter varies according to the deeds done in the body, and that the Protestant Christian is not deprived of the stimulus to duty which comes from the hope of eternal recompense. We conclude this part of our subject with another most excellent extract from Dr. Chalmer's: "Now our safety, our state of salvation, or which is the same thing, our state of spiritual health, and so of spiritual enjoyment, lies in a state of earnest, progressive, aspiring holiness, along a career in which the greater our holiness the greater will be our happiness also; or in other words the more virtuous here, the greater will be our preferment there—the more we multiply and heighten our graces on this side of death, the greater will be our moral and spiritual treasures through all eternity. Thus ought we to understand the precepts of laying up our treasures in heaven; and the virtues of the new creature, instead of being the price which we give in exchange for these treasures, or only the evidence of their being in reserve for us by the time that we enter into Paradise, are the very treasures themselves which regale and satisfy the spirits of the celestials. Holiness is more than the way to some better and higher landing-place; holiness is itself the landing-place, and our restoration to holiness the great object of the economy under which we sit. Christianity does not begin with virtue and end with justification—it begins with justification and ends with virtue."

Again, it is argued, that not only are the threatenings and promises of God's word made ineffective by our doctrine of justification, but that all moral elements having been carefully excluded therefrom, there remains in it no moral force that is at all adequate to the production of obedience and holiness. The connection between justification and sanctification, it is claimed, cannot be vindicated.

From the elements that constitute justification the Protestant view shuts out sancification, retaining forgiveness of sin, restoration to God's favor, adoption into his family and heirship in the kingdom of heaven. These, our opponents regard as external things, not necessarily involving any moral change in the justified. Thus, in their opinion, the only element that involves a change of character is carefully eliminated from our doctrine.

And not only this, but we do not admit any moral quality, they say, into the condition by which a sinner becomes justified. The condition is a single thing—faith; and that faith justifies, not as Bishop Bull holds, because it is a complex quality including all the works of Christian piety, but because it is the instrument by which the righteousness of Christ is embraced. Thus, the Apology admits “that faith is efficacious not on account of its worthiness but because of the divine promises.” The Formula of Concord declares, “that faith, in the case of justification before God, relies neither on contrition, nor on love, nor on other virtues, but on Christ alone. For faith justifies, not because it is a work of great value and an eminent virtue, but because it apprehends and receives the merit of Christ in the promise of the Gospel.” Thus it seems we are obliged to look to faith alone not only to justify us but also to sanctify us and to take our stand with Luther when he says, “Justifying faith is trust, comes first, justifies by itself and then gives birth to all graces.” Faith is the one thing of all the parts of justification that is within us, and thus becomes the only point of attachment for all the Christian virtues and the Christian works that the word of God requires. Will the existence of justifying faith insure the various effects involved in sanctification?

Let us, in seeking to answer this question, distinctly bear in mind that the object that must be secured is sanctification or the production of holiness and obedience to the divine will, and this must somehow be the fruit of faith. Now, holiness is not a mere logical process but in the words of Prof. Wace, “something created and developed in us by the influence of a personal Spirit on our souls.” According to the Scriptures it is Christ that has undertaken to save his people from their sins; that gave himself for the Church that he might sanctify and cleanse it and present it to himself at last as a glorious Church not having spot or wrinkle or any such thing. This purification Christ brings about by the agency of the Holy Spirit, for as Dr. Newman well says: “Since his ascension Christ has ceased to act by his own hand but sends his Spirit to take his place, he himself coming again by his Spirit. This is evidently

the truth taught by the Saviour himself in John, 14 : 16-18.

The Holy Spirit, bestowed by Christ, takes up his abode permanently in the soul of the believer, brings him under the influence of the truth and works in him that love which is the fulfilling of the law. We need not stop to show that these agencies and means, expressly appointed for this purpose, will prove adequate to the production of holiness and obedience. Proof of this will be furnished in the further discussion of this subject; besides, the efficiency of the instrumentalities is generally admitted. The point to be established here is that faith brings us into connection with them—unites us to Christ, secures the gift of the Holy Spirit, subjects us to the power of truth and begets in us that love to God and to man on which hang all the law and the prophets. If faith can accomplish this connection, then our question is decided in the affirmative, and the fact is established that the faith which justifies also sanctifies, and the charge that it prohibits good works must be withdrawn.

And, first, will faith bring us into union with Christ so as to secure his active co-operation in the work of delivering our souls from the dominion of sin? The union contemplated will require the consent of both parties concerned—that of Christ who is to save, and that of the penitent who is to be saved; and the moment both are willing the union is consummated and the work of deliverance from sin is begun. Just as the physician and the patient have come together when the former has agreed to undertake the sick man's cure, and the latter has concluded to submit himself into the physician's hands for treatment, so Christ and the lost sinner have come together when Christ consents to undertake the sinner's salvation from sin and the sinner himself has decided to surrender himself to Christ to be healed of all his spiritual diseases.

As far as Christ is concerned he is ever ready and willing to perform his part in the work. He gave himself for the Church to sanctify and cleanse it and he will not be remiss in the office he has taken upon himself. He came to seek and to save that which is lost; he went about doing good. And he has expressly and emphatically declared, "him that cometh unto me I will in no wise cast out." Christ, as shown, being always willing

to accept men for salvation, it only remains for the sinner to consent to commit himself into Christ's hands in order to complete the union, and to bring into action the various agencies and appliances appointed for man's deliverance from sin and his restoration to holiness. This is clearly the teaching of Christ himself in various declarations that fell from his own lips. "How often would I have gathered thy children together, even as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings, but ye would not." And to the Jews he said on another occasion with the utmost plainness, "Ye will not come to me that ye might have life." Both these passages teach that if men had been willing, their salvation would have been assured. This fact simplifies the question to be answered and reduces it to this form: Will faith, wherever it exists, secure the believer's consent to submit himself into the hands of Christ for spiritual treatment? The physician stands ready. Will the sick man accept him? Will faith make him willing to submit himself into his hands?

To answer this question let us determine what conditions of mind are necessary to induce this willingness and self-surrender. We say there must be in the first place a sincere desire for the salvation that Christ has to bestow—a desire for the pardon of sin and restoration to the friendship of God—a desire also for deliverance from sin and restoration to holiness. Unless a man is sincerely concerned to secure the blessings which Christ came to impart, he certainly will not take the trouble of going in pursuit of them. Again, this desire must be sufficiently strong to make a man willing to accept the blessings wished for in any way and on any conditions according to which it may please Christ to communicate them. Many a young man appreciates the advantages which a full course at college secures and would like to possess them, but unfortunately he does not desire them sufficiently to subject himself to the laborious and self-denying process involved in such a course. Before his desire will lead to any practical results it must rise to a height in which it will accept the course notwithstanding the hard work and the self-denial that belong to it. So in respect to the vastly greater blessings of holiness, one must desire them to such a degree as to be willing to submit to the entire discipline Christ in his wis-

dom may see fit to ordain. This, as any one can see, implies a complete surrender of one's self into the hands of the Saviour and involves an act of the will.

To this desire another element, however, must be united in order to produce this willingness; and that element is trust in Christ. At his hands we are to receive the unspeakable gift of salvation. But we are sinners, under sentence of condemnation; and can we in such a case look for favors at the hands of Christ? It is evident that before we can come to him for the gift of his Holy Spirit to accomplish our sanctification we must trust in his mercy and believe in his willingness to forgive us our sins. So likewise trust is necessary to induce us to make the complete self-surrender required to our salvation. No man will unqualifiedly subject himself to the control of another unless he has unlimited confidence in his wisdom and good will. Nor will any man agree in all things to follow the directions and submit to the requirements of Christ unless he is persuaded that Christ is more competent to direct him than he is himself, and that Christ is truly his friend and aims at his advantage in all that he ordains. From this examination we find that in order to beget the willingness which will lead a man to submit himself into the hands of Christ for sanctification, there must be an honest and unqualified desire for the blessing he has to bestow and at the same time full confidence in his wisdom and goodness.

Now, does faith include in itself these two elements—of desire and trust? Does it include desire? Faith presupposes contrition in respect to sin; never exists unless contrition has previously existed. And contrition unquestionably constitutes desire for reconciliation with God as also for freedom from the power of sin. In the opinion of our Confessional teachings, contrition and faith are the two parts of repentance, using the word repentance in its larger sense. Faith, therefore, necessarily presupposes contrition, that being the first part of repentance. Luther says, "Faith is inseparable from contrition." The Apology declares: "Faith dwells in those who are truly penitent; whose alarmed consciences feel the wrath of God and their own sins." The Formula of Concord says, "A true and saving faith therefore does not dwell in those who entertain no contri-

tion and sorrow and who have the evil design to remain in sin and to persevere in it." Accordingly in every case in which faith is known to exist, in every such case we are assured that contrition has preceded. Now this contrition which always accompanies faith is described as including acknowledgment of sin, sorrow for sin and abstinence therefrom; and a state of mind like this, as all who have experienced it can testify, certainly contains an earnest and honest desire for deliverance from sin, or as the Apology expresses it: "Such a heart or conscience that has fully felt its wretchedness and sins and is truly alarmed, will not relish or seek the lusts of the world." Where there is anything like a true realization of the evil of sin, its degradation, its guilt, its ruinous tendency, and where, in addition, there is a sense of personal sinfulness, depravity and peril, there will arise a strong desire for deliverance from the punishment and from the power of sin. The contrition presupposed by faith accordingly supplies the element of desire needful to move the mind in search of a deliverer.

But, faith also includes in itself the trust that will result in the believer committing himself into the hands of Christ for salvation. The anxiety awakened in the contrite spirit gives the mind no rest; it is in misery and must have deliverance. This feeling of wretchedness will impel to unceasing efforts after peace and joy. Trust in Jesus will turn these efforts in the direction of Christ and eventuate in the sinner's committing himself into the hands of Christ. For, according to the Lutheran view of faith, it is not a mere knowledge of the things to be believed concerning Christ; nor mere approving assent to the truthfulness of scripture declarations concerning him; but it is confidence in Christ—an act of the will's resting in him and embracing him as our present good and as the cause of the forgiveness of sins and of eternal life. That faith will thus result in the entrusting of the soul of the believer into the care of Jesus will appear from a consideration of the circumstances of the case. Faith involves desire to be freed from the misery sin has occasioned; it is accompanied also by a feeling of our own inability to deliver ourselves, and constrains us to look for help from without; in casting about for a deliverer it perceives in Christ

the helper it needs—one who can and will save. Now we maintain that the combined effect of this longing for relief from present wretchedness, this conviction that we cannot rescue ourselves by anything we may attempt, and the persuasion that Christ both is able and willing to deliver us, will lead such a soul to surrender itself to the friend of sinners for salvation in whatever way and by whatever discipline his love and wisdom may conclude to employ. And when this self-surrender has once taken place then the union between Christ and the penitent is an accomplished fact.

Our faith, whose effects we are seeking to ascertain, in so far as we have now traced its operations, has been instrumental in inducing the sinner to commit himself into the hands of Jesus and has thus brought about a union between himself and one that is mighty to save. In the act of sinking, all hope in self utterly gone, he surrendered himself to Christ and cried, Lord save me. Immediately, as in Peter's case, Jesus stretched out his hand and caught him. There is where we want him. With the hand of Jesus on him we know he is safe, and that ere long there will come to us a joyful shout: "Bless the Lord, oh my soul, and forget not all his benefits; who forgiveth all mine iniquities; who healeth all my diseases; and redeemeth my life from destruction."

Now when an individual, desirous of salvation, and convinced of the uselessness of undertaking the work himself, has entrusted himself into the hands of Jesus by faith, then the Holy Spirit is given him to abide with him continually, to enlighten his mind through a knowledge of the truth and to incline his heart to do the things that are agreeable to the will of God. Thus in consequence of our faith in Jesus we obtain the gift of the Holy Ghost to the end that we may be sanctified. Accordingly we are taught in the Apology to the Augsburg Confession that "we cannot receive the Holy Spirit except through faith. * * * The veil which covers the face of Moses cannot be removed except by faith in Christ the Lord, through whom the Holy Spirit is imparted." Our Article also declares that the Holy Spirit is received by faith. This is also the teaching of Scriptures: John 7 : 38-39; Acts 2 : 38; 10 : 43-45; 11 :

15-17; 15 : 8-9; 19 : 2, and Galatians 3 : 2-5 and 14. From these scripture declarations it is clear that after attaining to faith in the Lord Jesus Christ, the believer in consequence of his faith receives the permanent gift of the Holy Spirit. But it is not on account of a direct faith in the Holy Ghost that the Spirit is communicated, but because we have been justified through our faith in Christ; the gift of the Spirit is the purchase of Christ's atonement and is imparted permanently only to them who are reconciled to God through faith in the Lord Jesus. Meyer on Gal. 3 : 14 pronounces the reception of the Spirit as the consequence of justification and an aim of Christ's redeeming death—faith thus becoming the apprehending cause both of justification and of the reception of the spirit. Dr. Eadie, speaking on the same passage says, "The reception of the Spirit implies justification and is a blessing either dependent on it or collateral with it." Or, in other words the habitual presence of the Holy Spirit is not to be enjoyed by any one who is not in right relationship to the Father through Christ. The gift of the Holy Spirit in its permanent form is in reality an indwelling of a divine being in the human soul and this can take place only after reconciliation with God through the acceptance of Christ. That the spirit comes to us not directly but through the mediation of Christ is evident from numerous and plain passages of God's word. Matt. 3 : 11; John 7 : 39; 14 : 16, 26; 16 : 7; 14 : 8. The last passage very clearly implies, that in some mysterious way the coming of the Spirit is also the coming of the Saviour—that the Lord Jesus comes again to his disciples by and through his Spirit. All these passages in the most emphatic manner make the bestowment of the Spirit dependent upon the work and will of Jesus, and from previous passages we learn that it is the will of Christ to give the Holy Spirit to them that are justified through faith in his name.

It is also the constant teaching of our Confessions that we become partakers of the Holy Ghost by means of faith. Now then having connected the reception of the Holy Spirit with faith in Jesus, can it be made to appear that from this abiding presence of the Holy Spirit in one who is in the state of mind denoted by faith, obedience and holiness will invariably en-

sue? We feel that we can make our minds easy as to the sanctification of the man that has become a temple for the indwelling of the Holy Spirit. If faith in Jesus secures the inhabitation of the Spirit of Christ we run no risk in predicting that faith will sanctify.

Says Bishop O'Brien in his work on Faith: "The Bible is express in referring the sanctification, which it promises to those whom God justifies, to the direct exercise of the power of his everlasting Spirit continued to the very end of their mortal career; distinctly ascribing every advance in holiness which believers make, every act of obedience that they perform, every Christian grace that they acquire, all holy counsels by which they are directed, all good works that they bring forth, all to the continued exercise of the same power by which it has been first given to them to believe in the Redeemer."

From Luther on Gal. 2 : 18 we quote the following: "Now after that a man is once justified and possesseth Christ by faith, and knoweth that he is his righteousness and life, doubtless he will not be idle but as a good tree he will bring forth good fruits. For the believing man hath the Holy Ghost, and where the Holy Ghost dwelleth he will not suffer a man to be idle but stirreth him up to all exercises of piety and godliness, and of true religion, to the love of God, to the patient suffering of afflictions, to prayer, to the exercise of charity towards all men." Says our Article: "Faith alone constantly secures grace and forgiveness of sins. And because the Holy Spirit is given through faith the heart becomes qualified to perform good works. For before this, while it is without the Holy Spirit it is too weak, &c., &c. The Smalcald Articles declare "That Paul in Rom. 7 : 14-25 shows that he wars with the law in his members, &c.; and this not by his own powers but by the gift of the Holy Ghost that follows the remission of sins. This gift daily cleanses and purges the remaining sins, and works so as to render man pure. * * * For the Holy Ghost does not permit sin to have dominion, to gain the upper hand so as to be completed, but represses and restrains it so that it must not do what it wishes." The testimony of Scripture is to the same effect. "For the fruit of the Spirit is in all goodness and righteousness

and truth," Eph. 5 : 9. "But the fruit of the Spirit is love, joy, peace, long-suffering, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance." Gal. 5 : 22; Acts 15 : 8-9; 1 Pet. 1 : 22.

From the foregoing examination we find it to be the teaching of our Church, grounded on the testimony of God's infallible word, that the faith to which we ascribe justification brings about a union between Christ and the believer, by begetting in the latter a state of mind disposing him to commit himself unqualifiedly into the hands of Jesus for deliverance from his spiritual diseases; and that in consequence of this union resulting from justification by faith, the habitual presence and operation of the Holy Spirit is secured to the Christian—the result of which indwelling must necessarily be his deliverance from sin and his complete restoration to holiness. The personal influence of Christ exerted upon the believer by means of the Holy Spirit is sufficient cause to account for sanctification in the case of all who believe.

But this view of faith, which unites to Christ, secures pardon and reconciliation and sends the individual forth anew on his course with the gift of the Holy Ghost in his heart, involving as it does an exercise of the affections and an action of the will, and accounting so satisfactorily for all the internal changes necessary to sanctification, is of course stoutly combatted by all who are opposed to our doctrine of justification. They regard faith as an act of the understanding only—a mere intellectual assent to the truths revealed in the Scriptures, having no moral side and no sanctifying power, until made perfect or effective by the addition of charity. Thus the Apology complains, "Our adversaries think that faith consists in a knowledge of or an acquaintance with the history of Christ; hence they teach that we can believe even when sunk in mortal sin." Luther declares, "Moreover these perverters of the Gospel of Christ do teach that even that faith which they call faith infused, that is faith not received by hearing or gotten by working, but created in man by the Holy Ghost, may consist with deadly sin and that the worst men may have this faith; therefore they say if it be alone (not informed by charity) it is idle and utterly unprofitable."

ble." Davenant says, "That misshapen faith which the Papists denominate orthodox, Christian and justifying, is found to be in most cases idle and buried in sleep. Bellarmine while vehemently contending that justifying faith is nothing else than an assent to what is contained in the word, at the same time confesses, yea, contends, that this justifying faith consists with the fact of those endowed with such a faith remaining wicked." Of course if this be the correct view of faith, then there is in faith itself no sanctifying power, and wicked men and devils may possess it. As the practical effects of faith will be entirely different if our opponents' definition of faith be adopted, we must be sure, in order that our argument may be valid, that all we have claimed for faith is actually in it. That there is in faith in Jesus something more than mere belief in the truthfulness of scripture testimony is the opinion of Protestant writers generally. Those who are not willing to admit that trust is an element of faith, yet insist on it, that it is an invariable, inseparable consequent thereof—that where there is sincere and genuine faith there a "trustful reception of Christ, though not one of faith's essential elements, is certainly one of its immediate and unfailing results; that therefore a trustful reception of Christ as he is offered in the Gospel is essential to the nature, or at all events, inseparable from the acting or exercise of faith in Christ." The practical effect is the same, whether trust or confidence be regarded, as is most generally done, as a component part, or as an inseparable concomitant of faith. Virtually, therefore, Protestant writers are of one mind in regard to the nature of faith. But let us hear the testimony of various writers on this subject. And first that of Luther himself in that celebrated description of faith which has elicited praise from such a sturdy opponent as Mœhler. "Faith," says he, "is a divine work in us which changes us and regenerates us of God, and mortifies the old Adam, making us quite different persons in heart, mind, disposition and in all our faculties and bringing with it the Holy Spirit. Oh, this faith is a living, active, efficacious, powerful principle; it must incessantly perform that which is good. It never asks whether good works are to be performed, but before the inquiry is made, it has done them and it is always in action.

* * * Hence men without constraint become willing and desirous to do good unto all, to serve all and to endure all things to the honor and praise of God who manifested this grace to him; so that it is impossible to separate works from faith, yea, as impossible as it is to separate heat and light from fire."

Schmid, in his *Dogmatics*, gives knowledge, assent, and confidence as the essential elements of faith. Confidence he defines as an act by which the will rests in Christ, the Mediator, as our present good and the cause of another good, namely the remission of sins and the attainment of eternal life." This confidence the author claims is to be regarded as the most essential element of faith, the element that embraces and appropriates salvation. This statement as to the nature of faith the author supports by the declarations of various eminent theologians, who all speak of confidence as an act of the will, desiring and seeking mercy, embracing and receiving Christ. The writers referred to are Chemnitz, Quenstedt, Hollazius and Baier. Meyer on Rom. 1 : 5 says: "Faith is, according to Paul, the conviction and confidence (*Assensus* and *Fiducia*) regarding Jesus Christ as the only perfect mediator of the divine grace and of eternal life, through his work of atonement. Faith alone is the apprehending cause of the salvation promised and obtained through Christ, but because it transfers us into living and devoted fellowship with him, altogether of a moral character, it becomes the subjective moral power of the new life regenerated through the power of the Holy Spirit, of the life in Christ, which, however, is the necessary consequence, and never the ground of justification."

Davenant says: "Faith which Scripture acknowledges to be justifying has in itself the complicated act of the will and the intellect. For to apprehend Christ to be the Redeemer of the world and to assent to this proposition, "Whosoever believeth shall be saved," truly appertains to the intellect; but this faith, though at once beholding and acknowledging the Redeemer, does not justify, before the sinner has drawn, as it were, Christ to his own home and joined himself to the Mediator; and this does not happen unless by that act of confidence which, we assert, belongs also to the will." Similar views may be cited from

Owen, who speaks of faith as a trusting in Christ—receiving Christ—committing ourselves to Christ, a proper reception of Christ and his salvation, and Julius Hare, who throughout holds and ably vindicates the Lutheran view of faith as including trust in Christ. Bishop O'Brien describes faith in the blood of Christ as faith in a remedy; faith in the Lord Jesus as similar to faith in a physician, in an advocate or in a friend. Crawford says: "The fiducial trust and acquiescence of the heart is comprehended in faith either as one of its constituent elements or as one of its proper fruits." Citations of like import from Chalmers, Prof. Wace, *Boyle Lectures*, Griffiths, *Divine Foot Prints*, and Melville, *Golden Lectures*, must be omitted for want of space. Prof. Hill in his "Divinity" says: "The Gospel bringing a remedy for the present state of moral evil, the mind is not disposed to accept of the remedy until a change upon the will and the affections be produced by the Spirit of God. Hence faith stands opposed to the love of sin which produces an aversion to the remedy; to that love of the world which produces an indifference about it; to that pride and self-confidence which make it appear unnecessary." Dr. Hodge says: "Faith is a complex act of the soul involving the concurrence of the understanding and the will. Assent to a moral truth is a moral act; assent to a promise made to ourselves is an act of trust. * * * The disposition to believe testimony or moral evidence, has its foundation in the will. Actual trust in a promise is an act of the will and not a simple judgment as to its trustworthiness. * * * The specific act of saving faith which unites to Christ and is the commencement, root and organ of our whole spiritual life, terminated upon Christ's person and work as Mediator, as presented in the offers and promises of the Gospel."

Dr. Valentine in the Holman Lecture on "Justification" says: "The essential thing, which itself constitutes the reality and fullness of faith is trust or confidence. It is the "fiducia" of the old theologians and expresses the act in which the penitent reposes in the merit and grace of the Redeemer. In it he accepts Christ who is a perfect Saviour and lays an appropriating hold of him, as he has been made unto him wisdom, righteousness, sanctification and redemption. It brings the believing soul and Christ

together. * * * Faith must therefore be regarded as apprehending the gracious work and righteousness of Jesus Christ. Hence, Luther's expression, Faith taketh hold of Christ and hath him present and holdeth him enclosed as the ring doth the precious stone," EVAN. REV., Oct. 1869. Dr. Sprecher in his *Ground-work* of Luth. Theology says: "Thus true faith involves both knowledge and feeling; it embraces an act of the intellect and a movement of the susceptibility. But it is also connected with an act of submission to God, which is manifestly an act of the will. Therefore knowing, feeling, and willing operate together in faith. * * * It has an object and consequently it has a cognitive element; it approves that object and consequently it has an emotional element; it assents to that object and surrenders itself to it and consequently it must have a volitional and active element."

The testimony of the leading Protestant Confessions is in harmony with the view here advocated. Besides the emphatic declaration in our Article that the faith here spoken of is not the mere belief of a historical fact concerning Christ, which devils and the ungodly possess, the Apology says explicitly, "And that no one may suppose that it is mere knowledge we will add further, it is to wish and to receive the offered promise of the remission of sins and of justification. * * * Again, Faith is not only knowledge in the intellect but also confidence in the will, that is, it is to wish and to receive that which is offered in the promise, namely reconciliation and remission of sins." It may be well to remark at this point that many of these declarations concerning the nature of faith as existing in the intellect and the will were made at a time when it was customary to regard the mind as divided into two parts only, viz., intellect and will—the affections and desires being regarded as parts of the latter. The Heidelberg Catechism (in its definition of faith) also adds the element of confidence to the knowledge whereby we hold for truth all that God has revealed to us in his word. The Westminster Confession speaks of faith as a receiving and resting on Christ and his righteousness. The principal acts of saving faith, according to it, are accepting, receiving and resting upon Christ alone for justification, sanctification, and eternal

life by the covenant of grace. The English Homilies define the faith spoken of in the Thirty-Nine Articles as follows: "True lively faith is not only the common belief of the articles of our faith but it is a true trust and confidence in the mercy of God through our Lord Jesus Christ and a steadfast hope of all good things to be received at God's hands. * * * It is not only to believe that Holy Scripture and all the articles of our faith are true but also to have a sure trust and confidence in God's merciful promises."

That trust in Christ is an essential element of the faith that saves, likewise has the clear support of God's word, as will become evident by considering the following scripture passages in which the term faith occurs. In Matt. 6 : 30; 8 : 26; 14 : 31, and 15 : 28 various individuals are reproved for the weakness of their faith and others commended for the greatness of theirs, and by examination of the circumstances in each case it will be found that it is want of trust that is censured and the exhibition of it that is extolled.

In Luke 16 : 11; John 2 : 24; 1 Thess. 2 : 4; Gal. 2 : 7; 1 Tim. 1 : 11, and 2 Tim. 1 : 12, the verb corresponding to the Greek noun for faith is used, and in all these cases Mr. Crawford claims that the word means "not merely the belief that a certain person is trustworthy, but the consequent reliance that is placed in him to the effect of consigning important interests to his care."

Various synonymous terms and figurative expressions are employed to denote believing in Jesus, such as receiving Christ, coming to him, eating the bread of life, of which expressions the same writer says, "Their meaning is not exhausted by a mere belief respecting Christ that he sustains a certain character, has performed a certain work and is fraught with certain blessings. There is further implied a trustful reception of him and a personal application to him for such blessings as he has to bestow." Of the passage in John 5 : 40 the author says: "Here is not only unbelief in a statement, but the wilful refusal of an offer, which ought to have been trustfully and cordially accepted." Again in 1 Jno. 5, the apostle speaks of a record or testimony to be believed. The testimony is that God hath

given us eternal life and that this life is in his Son and concludes therefrom, "He that hath the Son hath life and he that hath not the Son hath not life." This passage plainly teaches that believing on the Son of God is not merely assenting to what Scripture testimony asserts concerning Christ, but is the actual having of the Son himself, without which, the having of eternal life is not possible. Merely to assent to the ability and willingness of Christ to save sinners, without the trust that actually commits the sinner into his hands, has no more virtue in it than the consenting to all the testimony kind friends may bear in favor of the skill of a physician, without an actual surrendering of ourselves into his hands for treatment.

In James 2 the faith which is a mere assent to the truthfulness of Scripture doctrines is decidedly rejected. The person holding a mere belief in scripture propositions is represented as professing to believe that there is but one God, as if this settled his claim to be regarded a believer in the Christian sense. This faith in the unity of God is commended and is praiseworthy, especially at a time in which the prevalent and popular opinion was that there were gods many and lords many. Yet according to James this is not enough. There is an element wanting to constitute faith in Christ, and what can that be but this important element of trust in Jesus, which begets a willingness to comply with the whole discipline of the Gospel unto salvation.

We may appear to have given more testimony on the nature of faith as involving trust and an action of the will, than was necessary, but our justification is that our whole argument to establish the connection between faith and sanctification hinges upon this point—that if our opponents are right in their definition of faith they can safely defy us to show that faith necessarily begets a life of obedience and true holiness. Besides, the testimony is interesting in itself and varied in expression and bears upon a subject, which is not only vital to our argument but, what is infinitely more important, to the salvation of immortal souls also.

Again, faith beside bringing us under the personal influence of Christ and of his Holy Spirit, also brings us under the power

of divine truth and under the influence which the realities of the whole spiritual world are capable of exerting upon the mind. The beings, objects and occurrences of the invisible realm revealed in the Scriptures have an effect upon us according to their nature, similar to that which the objects and events of the sensible, visible world are able to produce. This we will not stop to prove, as few will be disposed to question it, but will proceed to inquire whether it is to faith that we are indebted for bringing our minds into connection with these unseen spiritual verities. Now we feel confident that this can be established respecting faith inasmuch as it is by it that we attain to a knowledge of the existence of the invisible world with its beings, objects, and events and to such a realization of the same as to experience their influence upon our minds and conduct. As proof of this assertion respecting the office of faith we refer to the word of God, which describes faith as the substance of things hoped for and the evidence of things not seen, hereby teaching that it is by means of faith that we attain to certainty in regard to the existence of unseen things and confident expectation of obtaining that which we hope for, thus having to do with objects that sense cannot lay hold of. By faith Moses looked out toward a recompense of reward so far in the future and so unlikely, that neither the power of reason or sense extended to the same. By faith he endured as seeing him who is invisible. Faith brought God near to him and made him as real to his spiritual eyes as was the king of Egypt to his bodily vision. In John 3 : 11 f. we are assured that Christ came to tell us of heavenly things and likewise that it is by faith that his testimony is to be received. This is equivalent to saying that for our knowledge about heaven and heavenly things we depend upon our faith in the veracity and competency of Christ as a witness. From these several passages of Scripture it is plain that faith is the instrumentality by means of which we know, realize and appreciate the persons and things that make up the world beyond the sphere of sense. Archer Butler represents faith as the realizing power in respect to spiritual things. He says, "Its office is to make us see the unseen; to be the visual sense of the Spirit; beholds God around us even now; sees this

world pervaded by the providence of God and haunted by his angels. The spiritual system that encompasses us as Christians is the constant sphere of faith. And beyond them both stretches out into infinity that everlasting world which faith accepts with equal certainty."

Alexander Knox says, "What is faith but an apprehending of divine things as realities. He who finds himself in a storm on shipboard needs not argue himself into alarm, nor strive to recollect all the various circumstances of danger. If, therefore, divine and eternal things do once impress themselves as facts, religion will grow out of that impression by a necessity of nature, and in proportion to its strength it will influence all the movements of the inner and the outward man. The making then of this impression is the great operation of divine grace. Man cannot give it himself. * * * To have faith then is to have that lively sense of divine things which makes them efficient on our hearts, tempers and conduct. * * * All men would shudder at feeling the shock of an earthquake and would alike avoid a pestilential contagion. The things of eternity rightly impressed upon the mind are at least as much fitted to subdue all minds and work upon all tempers as either the earthquake or the pestilence."

To this argument, however, it is objected that it involves an inconsistency, inasmuch as the faith which connects with and brings under the influence of the whole truth of God's word is a very much more comprehensive thing than the instrumental faith to which Protestants ascribe justification; that in order to establish a connection between faith and sanctification we find ourselves under the necessity of quietly introducing into faith elements, which it was to our purpose to exclude when speaking of the faith that justifies because it simply apprehends the merits of Christ.

Möehler, for instance, claims that even Luther in his celebrated description of faith is in most amiable contradiction with the Lutheran theory of justification; that he became entangled in his own distinctions, ascribing to faith as the moral vivifying sentiment, the power of justification; whereas according to the

whole tenor of his system it is to faith as the organ which clings to the merits of Christ that he must impute this power. Good-sir, in his examination of the Westminster Confession, cites passages from Melanchthon's writings to show that he uses the term faith in an ambiguous sense—sometimes making it equivalent to trust or a part of faith, and sometimes using it in its full sense; that he, for example, ascribes forgiveness and comfort of heart to trust, and yet elsewhere says that by this faith which comforts our hearts the Holy Spirit is received. He says further that trust is no more faith than a part is the whole, and that it is contrary to fact to describe the faith which receives the Spirit and works righteousness as identical with the trust which, according to Melanchthon, receives justification. He passes a similar criticism on the authors of the Westminster Confession, maintaining that in the chapter (14th) on saving faith, they re-introduce everything done by faith itself, the act of believing and evangelical obedience, which they had carefully excluded from justification in the eleventh chapter, thus putting in place of that instrumental faith from which every moral quality had been eliminated, a full and rich faith which is the fruitful mother, under divine grace, of all Christian acts and habits. The substance of this writer's objection is summed up in the following words: "Absolutely nothing about faith has any connection, either as an element or condition, with the external justification or salvation, except that so-called instrumental part or function of faith. What then, is this part or function of faith? And, if it can be pointed out, how is it connected with the other parts or functions of faith and with the internal elements in general, which along with the external or imputative elements constitute our redemption?" He claims that it is utterly impossible to answer these questions satisfactorily.

The gist of the objection made by these several writers is that we have a certain kind of faith which receives forgiveness and reconciliation by apprehending Christ, and that when we are called on to show how this faith—the only part of justification that has its seat in the mind—produces sanctification, we at once and boldly slip other elements into it and thus make it an entirely different thing from the faith by which we are justified.

In replying to this objection we admit in the first place that the *fiducia* or trust to which we attribute justification is not identical with the term faith in its other sense, in which it is equivalent to belief in all the truths revealed in the Bible; yea, so different are they that the first alone has the power of producing pardon and restoration to God's favor, while the second may exist in the hearts of men who continue in sin and end in destruction. But while trust or faith in Jesus is different from the mere belief in the truth of Scripture, yet the former is never without the latter, as the latter may be and often is without the former. By this we mean to say that the faith which trusts in Jesus and forms the condition of justification always involves and presupposes belief in the testimony of Scripture; in short, that where the *fiducia* or trust exists there the *fides* or faith is also necessarily found. And herein, we feel assured, consists the connection between what Goodsir calls the part and the whole, and which connection he confidently asserts cannot be pointed out.

In 1 John 3 two faiths are spoken of—believing on the Son of God, and believing the record or testimony that God gave of his Son. It is very plain that the former, the believing on the Son, expressed afterwards as having the Son, is distinct from believing what God says concerning the son. Just as distinct as confidence in a physician whom we knew not before and for ourselves, is distinct from the testimony of the friend who induced us to entrust our life into his hands. And yet at the same time it is equally clear that the two things are connected, that the believing on the Son ensues because we make not God a liar but believe the testimony he gives in behalf of his Son. Such, then, is the connection of the faith called trust and the faith which is equivalent to belief of Scripture testimony, that wherever the former exists the other must have previously existed, that faith in Christ is an evidence and guarantee of faith in the truthfulness of all that is contained in the Scriptures. Accordingly, Chalmers says, "It is impossible that any one should believe in one thing on the ground of finding it in the Scriptures and not believe in everything which he finds to be there; or that he should believe in one saying of God because of confi-

dence in his truth, and yet not believe in all his sayings." Bishop O'Brien in his *Ten Sermons on Faith* says: "Confidence in Christ is grounded upon the testimony of God's word and requires of course a belief in that testimony; but it is manifestly distinct from such belief."

Our conclusion, therefore, is that whoever believes that Christ has had mercy on him, because of what the Scriptures say of his goodness and love, is in a state of mind in which he must necessarily believe everything to be true which the Bible sets forth as true; and faith in Christ, will as we have claimed, gradually bring a man under the influence and operation of all the facts and doctrines made known in the word of God, and whoever has come under the influence of truth has come under an influence that sanctifies; for the Saviour himself prays, "Sanctify them through the truth, thy word is truth;" cf. 1 Pet. 1: 22.

We have thus far, in following up the working of faith, ascertained that it brings into personal union with Christ, and as a consequence receives the personal gift of the Holy Ghost; also that it brings us under the operation of the various truths revealed in the word of God. We will yet further show that faith also begets and establishes the principle of love within our hearts, by which love we are constrained to do the things that are pleasing unto God. As to the effectiveness of love in producing and controlling our actions there can be no question. The Saviour declares that love to God and love to man virtually constitute the sum total of human requirement; on these two commandments hang all the law and the prophets. The apostle Paul after mentioning various commandments which Christians are bound to observe, adds, "And if there be any other commandment it is briefly comprehended in this saying, namely, thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself," and reaches this general conclusion, "Therefore love is the fulfilling of the law." Elsewhere he says, "The love of Christ constraineth us."

In reference to the influence of love Alexander Knox says, "Our love is ourselves. If we love base things we are base; trifling, we are triflers; earthly, we are worldly; divine and eternal things, we are spiritual and heavenly. Faith then is

such an apprehension of divine things as makes the things apprehended the object of supreme love."

Jacob Abbott has such confidence in the transforming power of love that he sums up his directions to parents in moulding their children, somewhat as follows: "Secure their love and then be in their presence what you want them to be." Archbishop Whately has a most excellent discourse on the subject, "Love toward Christ as a motive to obedience." In it he says that one of the most striking peculiarities of the religion of Christ is its continual appeal to the affections. He admits that Christ and his apostles also address themselves to the reason and the interest of men, but, especially in the case of believers, they chiefly insist upon love toward Christ as the mainspring of all their conduct.

The Catholic system, as is well known, attributes nearly everything in the matter of sanctification to the power of charity (love) which is the chief part of the inherent righteousness that expels sin and brings forth the works of righteousness.

The power of love in producing obedience to the divine precepts being universally admitted, there remains but one point further to be decided, does this love owe its origin to faith or may faith at times exist independently of love?

St. John declares that we love God because he first loved us, thus basing our love toward God upon his previous love to us. Now it is self-evident that this love to God could not possibly spring up out of the love of God toward us, unless we also believed that God did really love us as claimed. St. Paul in Galatians says, "faith worketh by love." Here evidently a close connection is affirmed between faith and love; yea, to faith a habitual working is ascribed as though it were its nature to operate by means of love. It is true that Cardinal Bellarmine argues that this passage ought to be read in the passive voice, meaning that faith is wrought or perfected by love. Boyse in his work entitled "Wrought Gold," has very satisfactorily and briefly answered this objection, by pointing out that the objection disagrees herein with the Fathers, and with their own Vulgate which is made binding on Catholics by the Council of Trent, as also with the English translation approved by the Church of Rome.

Again, the case of the woman at Simon's house teaches very plainly and emphatically that love is the result and fruit of forgiveness, as forgiveness is the fruit of faith. Thus the Saviour in the question he puts to Simon concerning the two debtors clearly intimates that love will follow forgiveness, and from his approval of Simon's answer it is equally clear that, in his judgment, love not only flows from forgiveness but is exactly proportioned to the extent of the forgiveness. And from this principle, that love is in proportion to the greatness of the sins forgiven, he argues that this woman's sins were many, for she loved much. And then that the love might not be viewed as the cause of the pardon, instead of the consequence, he says very plainly in verse 50, "Thy faith has saved thee." This passage (Luke 7 : 36-50) is in itself abundantly sufficient to prove the point made, that faith is the cause of love. But as this is a vital point in the controversy between Rome and Protestantism, as it in fact decides the dispute against Rome and all who with her say that faith cannot be depended upon to account for and to produce sanctification, they naturally make most desperate attempts to prove that faith does not invariably and necessarily bring forth love. Bellarmine accordingly discusses this proposition, "Whether justifying faith can be separated from love." He undertakes to maintain the affirmative of this question, but as Davenant asserts, shrewdly changes it into another, "True and Christian faith which justifies per modum dispositionis can be separated from love and other virtues." Dominic Soto, another theologian of Rome, maintains the proposition in this form, "True and orthodox faith and that which is necessary for justification, can exist without charity." Davenant over against them defends the Protestant view that faith and love invariably go together. We will not stop to follow out his argument as enough has already been said to establish the fact that, according to the Scriptures, love is the natural and inevitable product of faith,—that, constituted as is the human mind, where there once exists a sense of guilt and misery through sin, and this is followed up by the conviction that, through the merciful intervention of Christ, this guilt and its punishment has been remitted, and that in due course of time even the stains of sin are to

be completely wiped out—there can be no other state of mind than that of grateful love toward him who has delivered us.

The teaching of our Confessions is very clear and strong on the subject of the relation which faith and love bear to each other. Thus the Apology declares, "It is extremely foolish and improper on the part of our adversaries, to contend that even those who deserve eternal wrath, obtain forgiveness of sin through love or self-selected works of love; whereas it is clearly impossible to love God until the heart has taken hold of the remission of sins through faith. For a heart filled with anxiety and truly feeling the wrath of God, can never love him until he gives it relief and comfort and assures us of his grace. * * * What the Scholiasts say concerning the love of God is a wild conceit; it being impossible to love God before we know and embrace his mercy through faith. Then only does God become an object amiable, lovely. * * * How is it possible for us to love God when involved in such great terror and unspeakable agony, or feeling the great and terrible displeasure and wrath of God, which are then more forcibly felt than any one on earth is able to express or describe." Even Alexander Knox who with Bishop Jebb, regards justification by faith as a mere notion and nonentity, having no effect upon the heart and the affections, admits that "it may be the legitimate parent of feeling" in instances "where through error or ignorance there is a despair of divine mercy," and allows "that for this malady the truths included in the forensic system are perhaps the specific." From this admission it is very natural, with the Christian observer, to infer that if this doctrine is a specific for the very lowest forms of depression, a cure for the severest types of spiritual diseases, it will be an efficient remedy in all other cases.

Finally, in summing the points we have established in respect to faith, we find that wherever the faith that justifies exists, there will be the following results as a consequence of that faith. Faith brings the believer to a willingness to surrender himself completely to the control of Christ; this effects a union between the believer and Christ and secures the personal effort of Christ for the believer's salvation from the dominion of sin. In consequence of this union, the Saviour having now engaged him-

self to accomplish the believer's restoration to holiness, puts him permanently in charge of the Holy Spirit, who taking up his abode in the believer's heart, is continually at hand to instruct, to guide, to correct, to restrain from every wrong-doing and to incite to righteousness, in short to superintend and carry on the whole process of sanctification and salvation. By faith the believer is further brought into contact with, and under the operation of all the objects and beings that make up the whole invisible world around us, as far as these objects and beings are revealed in the Scriptures; or in other words, it brings him under the influence of all revealed truth, that truth which is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness, and makes the man of God complete and thoroughly furnished unto all good works. This truth the Holy Spirit makes use of as a means of promoting the holiness of the individual given into his charge. This truth contains the most powerful motive force that can be brought to bear upon the human mind, whether to beget or regulate activity. Besides, faith also supplies an impulse from within in the direction of holiness—the impulse of love, the most constant and powerful principle that we have any knowledge of, a principle which, according to Christ, is the sum and substance of the Ten Commandments, the essence of the whole duty of man. Through faith then the believer is brought under the operation of the most powerful inner impulse in existence; under the operation of the mightiest external motives in the universe, and under the personal care and supervision of the Spirit of Christ, the Spirit of sanctification, and if these combined influences are not adequate to guarantee the believer's holiness, then we feel very confident that nothing that the ingenuity of Rome has ever been able to suggest in place thereof, is worthy of a moment's consideration.

We conclude this discussion then in the words of our article, "From all this it is manifest that our doctrine instead of being charged with prohibiting good works ought much rather to be commended for teaching the manner in which truly good works can be performed."

ARTICLE II.
FEET-WASHING.

By REV. JOHN TOMLINSON, A. M., Abbottstown, Pa.

What do Lutherans hold and teach in regard to Feet-Washing? No answer to this question, that the writer knows of, has hitherto appeared in the LUTHERAN QUARTERLY. Some statement upon it seems to be proper, if not necessary, in view of the surroundings of many of its readers. A few thoughts, therefore, obtained chiefly from Lutheran sources are hereby presented.

St. John, 13 : 4, relates that after supper, our Lord laid aside his garments; and took a towel, and girded himself and washed the disciples' feet and wiped them with the towel wherewith he was girded.

Such an act was customary in oriental countries. One guest would wash the other's feet, or a servant would perform this service. But Christ obviously saw more in this act than custom and usage. What then is the import of his washing the disciples' feet? In answer to this question, the following reasons may be assigned:

I. *Fraternæ Charitatis Commendatio*. Christ meant to give his disciples and through them to all his followers an example of brotherly love. For he says: "I have given you an example, that ye should do as I have done to you," *i. e.* that ye love one another and bear one another's burdens. As long as Christians travel the way of this world, they will soil their feet and it will be necessary for them continually to have them washed. They must bear each other's infirmities and so fulfil the law of Christ, Gal. 6 : 2. For St. Peter says, 1 Ep. 4 : 8, "Charity covereth a multitude of sins."

II. *Humilitatis veræ demonstratio*. The Lord Jesus, in the next place, gave his disciples an example of humility. Feet washing was a *sordidum ministerium*, a despised work which

belonged mostly to servants. The Saviour by performing this menial service exhibited to all his followers the most profound humility. Hence he says: "Ye call me Master and Lord; and ye say well; for so I am. If I then, your Lord and Master, have washed your feet; ye ought also to wash one another's feet;" *i. e.* serve each other with humility. "Verily, verily, I say unto you, the servant is not greater than his Lord, nor the apostle greater than he that sent him."

III. *Fructus passionis praefiguratio.* Christ, by this symbolical action, prefigured the fruit of his sufferings, viz.: that he would freely shed his blood, and that by his precious blood he would cleanse us from all sin, 1 John 1 : 7. Consequently he says: "If I wash thee not, thou hast no part with me." If Jesus had not shed his blood to expiate our guilt, we would have been excluded from the kingdom of God, and could have had no part in him. Hence Irenaeus says, Adv. haereses, Lib. 4, cap. 22, "Ipsium verbum per se ipsum abluit sordes filiarum Sion, manibus suis lavans pedes discipulorum. * * * Qui enim pedes lavit discipulorum, totum sanctificavit corpus et emundationem adduxit. Christ washed the disciples feet with his own hands to denote that he by himself would purge us from our sins and wash away the filth of the daughters of Zion, Is. 4 : 4, *i. e.* that he would purify the whole church from sin by his blood. Accordingly the Confession of the Armenians contains these words: "Christus pedes discipulorum suorum lavit, ut lueret peccatum pedum Adami, qui ad scientiae lignum ambulaverat." Christ by this feet-washing atoned for the sin of our first parents whose feet bore them to the forbidden tree in the Garden of Paradise.

IV. *A peccatis abluti jussio.* The Lord Jesus Christ by washing the feet of his disciples enjoined upon them and all his followers spiritual feet-washing that they should daily wash and cleanse themselves from sinful lusts and affections, which are pedes animae. The Saviour refers to this matter when he says, "He that is washed needeth not save to wash his feet, but is clean every whit." He would say, that although washed by baptism from sin, there are, nevertheless, remains of depravity and sinful lusts at which we must wash and cleanse while we

live. Such purification can only be effected by his blood and the power of the Holy Ghost. See 1 Cor. 6 : 11, where the apostle says: "Ye are washed, ye are sanctified, ye are justified in the name of the Lord Jesus and by the Spirit of God."

V. *Ad coenam praeperatio*. Christ washed the feet of the disciples before he gave them the sacrament, undoubtedly, with a view to teach his followers that they should wash and cleanse themselves from sin and iniquity by sincere repentance, before the celebration of the Holy Supper. The Lord's Supper is a great solemnity, the nearest approach to God this side of heaven. And Christ wished to impress his followers with the importance of making suitable preparation therefor. For St. Paul says: "Whosoever shall eat this bread, and drink this cup of the Lord, unworthily, shall be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord. For he that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh damnation to himself not discerning the Lord's body." 1 Cor. 11 : 27, 29.

VI. *Odii et irae extinctio*. Christ aimed by washing the feet of his disciples to quench the fire of covetousness and anger which Satan had kindled in the heart of Judas. He washed even the feet of Judas himself and warned him to consider what he was about to do. When the enemy kindles in our hearts the fire of enmity, hatred and wrath, we should think of the example of Christ and draw water out of the wells of salvation and extinguish it. Gal. 13 : 4.

VII. *Typi in V. T. Impletio*. Christ by washing the feet of his disciples fulfilled a beautiful type of the Old Testament. God commanded in Exodus 50, that the priests should wash their hands and feet before they went into the tabernacle to offer sacrifice or to carry the ark of the covenant. Hence Christ washed the feet of his apostles, as they, by the preaching of the Gospel, were to offer to God acceptable sacrifice and bear the ark of Jehovah into all the world.

These appear to be at least some of the reasons why Christ washed the feet of the disciples. But to signify all these things and instruct the disciples fully in them, one feet-washing was all that was necessary. One washing answered the same purpose that a thousand would. A further amplification of this

subject is not called for, as the multiplication of words often darkens counsel. We close with a few

OBSERVATIONS.

1. Feet-washing is no sacrament. To constitute a sacrament three things are required:

- a. A promise of grace and the pardon of sin.
- b. An express command to observe it in the Church to the end.
- c. A visible sign by which the grace of God is appropriated.

These requirements are not met in feet-washing. And it is, therefore, no sacrament, as Count Zinzendorf and others maintain.

2. The early Christians did not consider feet-washing of divine appointment, but simply an act of civility, (1 Tim. 5 : 10), or a *Muster-Handlung*. If feet-washing were an ordinance of the church, every other good work would be so regarded, and the church would be burdened with rites and ceremonies. Ambrose in the 14th century practiced it in the church at Milan, but the sacramental idea of feet-washing has been by no means prevalent.

3. Great stress is laid on these words of our Lord, viz.: "If I then, your Lord and Master (teacher) have washed your feet, ye ought also to wash one another's feet." On these words Dr. Pfaff, of Tübingen, comments as follows: "Nach Beschaffenheit der Zeit, Orts und der Nothdurft, nicht dem äußerlichen Dienst, sondern der Bedeutung nach, durch Demuth und Beweisung der Liebe wie es nicht ungemein is in der Schrift, dasz unter dem Bilde eines Liebes-werks alle andere verstanden worden. Dann ist das 'leibliche Füsz-Waschen ein heuclerisch und blindes Gespötte, wenn es eine Erfüllung des Gebots Christi seyn solle."

On the words, So seydt auch ihr schuldig einander die Füße zu waschen, the Berleburg Bible contains the following exposition: "Man solle bereit und willig seyn, einem jeden auch dem geringsten Liebes-dienst zu erweisen. Da musz es nicht heißen: Nein, zum Fusz-hader lasz ich mich nicht machen! Sollt ich eines andern seinen Koth abwaschen? Ey du hast ja auch Koth: der andere thut dirs wieder. So ists ja temperirt genug."

4. Feet Washing is a *real* service and can not be converted into a matter of mere form and ceremony.

5. Neither can a holy duty like that of humility be changed into a mere ceremony. This would be a perversion of the teaching of Jesus Christ.

6. Human additions to the word of God lessen the influence of divine appointments.

7. Virtue should never be put where it does not belong. It should always be put in the blood of Christ, the Holy Ghost, the word of God, faith and prayer, and not in the externals of religion.

ARTICLE III.

ROMAN CATHOLIC MISSION PRACTICE.

Translated from DR. G. WARNECK'S "Protestantische Beleuchtung der römischen Angriffe auf die evang. Heidenmission," by REV. WM. ROSENSTENGEL, A. M., Grand Island, Nebraska.

Roman missions love to laud themselves that they are older than ours. This is a fact and it gives our opponents, no doubt, many advantages. One of these is that they had already gathered an abundance of experiences, when we first began to learn. But it seems remarkable that up to this day these experiences of centuries appear never to have been scientifically systematized. I have, at least, not succeeded in discovering traces of such a system in all the extensive literature of Catholic missions which I have perused. Not even a single article, that treats of the methods of mission work, has come to my notice. Certainly there are in existence detailed instructions for the missionaries, but it seems they are kept secret. In this respect, too, Protestant missions essentially differ. The longer their work, the more they are concerned about collecting their experiences, about sifting and formulating them with solid methods of missionary principles; in short, they aim at a mission-science. And though this science is not yet in a state of completion, stones are constantly being collected from year to year for the building. Without mentioning the many articles in the larger missionary journals, which treat of the methods of mis-

sion work, the scientific treatment of the same subject in works on practical theology and many other independent theoretical works on missions, both of a special and general nature—the conferences, held by missionaries and other leading men of the Church, offer an astonishing amount of technical mission material. This needs only to be collected, sifted and arranged in order to secure a systematic evangelical mission doctrine.

It is characteristic that the much older Catholic missions are in this respect surpassed by the much younger evangelical efforts. Catholic missions walk in their own tracks, and these are essentially the tracks of a traditional practice. This practice seems to have been subjected but little to the illuminating light of scientific methods and criticism. True, the Catholic missions of to day, although they oppose and condemn Protestant missions, have nevertheless adopted many Protestant methods and principles. For instance: the care of schools, the production of a home literature, the education of native workers, &c.; but on the whole they follow the old tracks of the renowned Xavier. We cannot then enter into an examination of a proper mission system of Rome. If we wish to know the principles according to which Roman missions are conducted, we must content ourselves with taking a few glances at her traditional practice.

We begin with her *practice of baptism*, and first of all with the baptism of heathen children, who are either apparently or really dangerously sick. The Roman view of the sacraments, according to which sacramental grace works magically, *ex opere operato*, justifies her practice. When we, too, by special request on the part of Christian parents, baptize their sick children, children who would be baptized at any rate, it is essentially a different thing from the Roman procedure. But here the children of heathen parents are baptized to a great extent by the laity, (women as well as men) who are especially appointed and trained for that purpose.* Children who would very likely remain unbaptized, they baptize *secretly*, without the knowledge of the parents.

*Jahrbücher 1873, VI. 25. In China special Schools have been established for baptist physicians. Kath. Missionen, 1884, 130.

We first give some statistics, mostly of recent date, in order to show to what an enormous extent this practice is carried on. Among the different Roman mission corporations, the Society of Foreign Missions in Paris gives the most regular and relatively the most complete statistics. According to these there were baptized within the districts occupied by this society in Japan, China, Tonkin, Cochinchina, Thibet and India, heathen children (it is not stated whether only in danger of death): In 1876, 213,042; 1877, 221,858; 1878, 269,723; 1879, 250,159; 1880, 256,387; 1881, 235,961: Total in 6 years, 1,447,130.* This is a prodigious number! And yet it includes only the districts occupied by the Paris Mission, in which districts there were laboring in 1881, 604 priests. But in order to show that this number is not an exception in Roman Mission work, but constitutes pretty nearly the normal status, several other examples may be cited, of course mainly from the Asiatic territory, where the kind of baptisms we speak of, seem principally to take place in such whole-sale numbers. In the western part of Tonkin there were baptized in 1864-70, 52,935† heathen children; in the eastern part of Tonkin 1864, 12,370, and 1865, 36,000;‡ in the middle part of Tonkin in 1864, 35,241, and in 1865 "the astounding number of 60,947."§ In China in the vicariate Kiangsi 1871, 4,000;§§ Kiagwau 1874, 14,913, 1875, 17,372; since 1848 (till 1860) over 130,000;|| Peking 1875, 7,578;¶ Petscheli

*During the same years on the same territory adult heathen baptisms are recorded: 1876, 13,835; 1877, 37,484; 1878, 60,496, (the year of famine); 1879, 28,737; 1880, 18,369; 1881, 18,983: Total, 177,904. In addition to these there are counted in the same years 166,038 baptisms of children of Christian parents, so that from 1876-81 the whole increase of Catholic Christians—not including the thousands of heathen children that remained alive—amounted to 343,942. But the real status is given as to these districts in 1876, 701,444 and in 1881, 796,710. According to this the increase would only amount to 95,266. There remains, therefore, a difference of 248,676 souls. It cannot be possible that all these, viz. above 30 per cent. should have died!—Roman statistics always have their mysteries.

†Jahrb. 1871, IV. 14.

‡Jahrb. 1866, V. 25. 1867, I. 58, "baptized and bought."

§Ibid, 1866, V. 36, 1867, I. 55.

§§Koth, M. 1873. 19.

||Ibid, 1875, 105. 1878, 82. Jahrb. 1867, V. 23. 1876, I. 32.

¶Kath. M. 1876, 83.

in 20 years 100,000,* afterwards an average from 11–13,000 yearly; Lutschneu 1839, 12,483; 1840, 15,766; 1841, 17,825; 1842, 20,068; 1843, 22,292; 1868, 24,381, and 1875 even 56,347;† Kuytschen 1875, 10,881, and 1876, 6,805;‡ even in the small district of Hong Kong an average per year from 1500 to 2000, whilst adult baptisms number from between 27 and 64.§ In Barma there were baptized in 1862, 1075; in Madura during 22 years 22,000 heathen children, who were dangerously sick.|| And these “numerous baptisms of children dangerously sick” are expressly designated “as the best fruits” of Roman mission work.¶

We remember that Marshall affirmed the method of the Roman missionaries to be the same at this hour as that of St. Paul (p. 64). The same classic writer assures us: “Catholic writers do not exaggerate.” Now if we are not to regard both these assertion—say as rhetorical phrases, then we ask proof from the writings of the New Testament that St. Paul baptized dying heathen children; baptized them at such wholesale rates, and with the aid of deception. We will say nothing of the impossibility of justifying such a perversion of baptism by the Scriptures, neither of this convenient method of making “Christians” or—as Catholic sources express themselves—even “angels” and “intercessors” in heaven,** nor the consequences†† that must follow such a course—let it suffice to say that the way and manner in which these baptisms are brought about is a downright disgrace to the whole missionary cause. A great multitude‡‡ of heathen converts and even *unconverted*§§ women and

*Kath. M. 1878, 154. 1879, 62. Jahrb. 1874, IV. 8.

†Venn 42. Jahrb. 1876, II. 58. ‡Ibid 1878, II. 53.

§Kath. M. 1881, 18. ||Jahrb. 1864, I. 12. Kath. M. 1878, 236.

*Jahrb. 1878, IV. 47. **Jahrb. 1867, I. 55. 1872, I. 51, &c.

††According to this method the surest way “to people heaven with angels” would be for God to cause a great mortality among all heathen children and Roman missionaries and their helpers do nothing else but baptize the dying children.

‡‡“Thousands of Christians” are engaged in this work. Jahrb. 1867, V. 23. In the small vicariate of Hong Kong alone between 62 and 90. (Kath. M. 1881, 19). Especially do these baptizing women receive the greatest praise. They are called “bewunderungswürdig.” Kath. M. 1878, 236, &c.

§§Kath. M. 1874, Beilage 3, 1882 Beilage 12. Camp. Allg. M.-Z. 1882 Beiblatt 59, where this characteristic history is reprinted.

men, who follow the calling of physicians, are appointed to go about sneakingly under pious pretence or as the yearbooks say: pious FRAUD, "unnoticed,"* and without any anticipation on the part of the parents of what is done to their children, baptism is administered.

It is rather difficult—thus writes the apostolic vicar of Madura—to make the simple believers at once understand, how meritorious and advantageous this service of love is to their dying children; but after they once see this, they willingly submit; and at certain places the zeal is such that care must be had, or else baptism is administered twice to the same child by different persons. * * * In several villages the Christians are really lying in wait to see that no heathen child may die unbaptized.† When the women (Täuferinnen) hear of the sickness of a heathen child, they visit its parent and offer their assistance. But if they are physicians and have received from the European missionaries medicine for eye-diseases, fever, &c., and because they *claim* to be physicians, they find everywhere admission and are naturally welcomed to the sick children. Finding the child very sick and thinking that it will surely die, they draw out a little sponge and a little bottle containing holy water, and whilst they wash the child's forehead, they at the same time baptize it *without the knowledge of the heathen parents*.‡

"This work requires much prudence" (Klugheit), writes his reverence, Father Ravary,§ especially where there are Protestant heathen converts. On this account Bishop Bataillan, who appeared otherwise to be a fearless hero, did not disdain practicing a pious deception. He writes himself, "that he kept two

*Reprinted in the Allg. M.-Z. 1876, Beiblatt 46.

†Jahrb. 1864, V. 34.—In Canton a single "poor Chinese woman" baptized during 20 years about 13,000 heathen children. Kath. M. 1874, Beilage, 4.

‡Kath. M. 1880 Beilage 12. And this is an *old* practice. Thus writes Father Bourges from India in the beginning of the last century: "We baptize—*without asking the parents for permission, which would certainly be denied*. Our catechists baptize *under pretence* that they are giving medicine." Beleuchtungen 1850, 30.

§Jahrb. 1867, V. 24.

little bottles, one containing fragrant water and the other baptismal water. Out of the first bottle he would pour a few drops upon the child's forehead and ask the mother to rub it. Then he would secretly exchange the bottles and pour baptismal water upon the child's forehead, without any one noticing it, and thus it would be born again."* This practice met, in the beginning, with no difficulty on the part of the Indians, until the parents became aware of the deception, and then, too, "pious fraud" was practiced.†

May 3, (1637) P. Pijart baptized a child two months old without the knowledge of the parents, who refused their consent. It was done in the following way: "*Our sugar performs miracles for us,*" he said. He tried to give the child some sugar-water to drink, after he had dipped his finger into it. As the father of the child did not trust the missionary, he told him not to baptize it. Then the missionary gave the spoon to one of the women standing near by and said: give it to him yourself. She drew near and found the child asleep. Then P. Pijart, under pretence of seeing whether the child was really asleep, touched the girl's forehead with his wet finger and baptized her. A few days before, the missionary had used the same means in order to baptize a boy from six to seven years of age. His sick father had repeatedly refused to be baptized, and when he was asked now whether he would be willing to have his son baptized, he replied: No! You will certainly not object to giving him a little sugar-water? asked P. Pijart. No, but you dare not baptize him.‡ The missionary immediately gave him a spoon-full, then a second and a third. At the last spoon-full, before he put in the sugar he, as by accident, suffered a few drops to fall on the boy, repeating at the same time the baptismal words. A little girl, who had been watching him, cried out: Father he baptizes him. The father of the child became greatly excited, but the missionary sought to appease him by saying: "Did you not see that I gave him sugar-water?"

Thus Catholic Missions write verbatim in the year 1882!

*Beleuchtungen 1845, 37.

†Kath. M. 1882, 147.

‡If I mistake not, the doctrine of the Roman Church allows expressly the baptism of the children of unbelievers against the wish of the parents.

And this Jesuit organ has not only not a word of reproof with respect to such a *fraudulent desecration of holy baptism*, but it even declares: "The impossibility to administer the holy sacrament in any other way, makes this kind of baptism, *though its validity be doubtful, allowable*;" adding only, "Certainly the missionary had dipped his finger forcibly enough, so that it was a sufficient washing and consequently a *valid baptism*."

These shocking facts do not merely speak, but they cry aloud, without any commentary.

Of course many of these hundreds of thousands of children, that have been baptized "at the point of death" remain alive; what becomes of them? will it ever *be told* them that they have been baptized secretly? are they to be considered Catholics? how is it made possible to instruct them? And yet these cunning paedobaptists find fault with the Russian popes, who, they say, did nothing else but baptize, and are bold enough to declare baptism, as administered by evangelical missionaries, to be sacrilegious.* But still more. With the zeal which the Catholic Christians manifest to carry on this "meritorious and advantageous" business in baptizing heathen children, many *not* in danger of death will doubtless be baptized also. The Paris Missions briefly say: "baptized children." Although the Catholic Missions write:† "Healthy children or such as are not very likely to be visited by death, they (die Täuferinnen) dare not baptize if the parents do not allow and give their consent that the child be also educated in the Catholic faith. *For otherwise baptism will be disgraced*." A remarkable confession! But let us hear once more: In 1846 the apostolic vicar in Mantchooria related that 40,000 heathen children in his vicariate had received baptism; that of this number only 20,000 had died.‡ According to this no scrupulous pains were taken in reference to the "critical condition." Now, according to Catholic sources, in these 20,000 cases, has baptism been disgraced or not? And how much of the same nature may have taken place outside of Mantchooria!

Only, in passing, let it be remarked that Roman missionaries

*Jahrb. 1874, V. 53. Marshall II. 467.

†1874, Beilage, 4.

‡Beleuchtungen, 1846, 56.

begin their work among the heathen by baptizing heathen children.* Often they buy them.† They baptize grown children of Christian parents, at stations where there are no missionaries, after having instructed them but *one day*.‡

We now turn to the baptism of *adults*. In our criticism upon that "classic" history of missions by Marshall, we have already seen how Rome glories in her multitudinous baptisms, or at least in the reports of them. Here again we first give some statistics. In Mexico the missions "blossomed so luxuriantly that within 15 years *seven millions* of natives received baptism."§ There, too, it was that during 37 years of mission work Turribius experienced such an outpouring of grace that he saw his zeal rewarded by 400,000 conversions.|| In Peru "Didacus (at different places and in a few years) snatched away from the power of the devil 57,000 souls; and Father Sandoval baptized in New Granada, in 7 years, 30,000.¶ In Hayti P. Ferdinand administered baptism with his own hand to more than 50,000 idolaters; and in Kongo P. Hieronymus baptized within 20 years more than 100,000 souls.** In Manilla were baptized within 9 years 255,000.†† In China within 14 years 100,000; in Tonkin in 2 years even 80,000.‡‡ It was the same in Japan. Here P. de Torrez baptized with his own hand 30,000; a person not named 70,000; and during one year, 1599, 70,000 "conversions"§§ took place. How fast the progress in the older missions in India has been, we have seen already.

What value these "conversions," brought about by such whole-

*Kath. M. 1879, 90.

†Ibid, 1880, 172. 1883, 91, 199. Jahrb. 1785, III. 72. In order to accomplish this, they even enter into negotiations with slave-dealers. Jahrb. 1883, I. 64, 73. Kath. M. 1884, 135.

‡Jahrb, 1883, III. 74. In the same place we are told that at these baptisms, instead of a respectful "silence," there had been "a dreadful noise." "Satan had been raging because on that day so many souls were snatched away from him." It appears to us that Satan need not be "raging" about *such* baptisms.

§Henrion I. 392, 435.

||Henrion II. 3.

¶Ibid. I. 512. II. 133.

**Ibid. II. 64, 345.

††Ibid. II. 32. Kath. M. 1880, 6.

‡‡Henrion II. 376, 390. Jahrb. 1867, V. 16.

§§Henrion I. 395, 599. II. 210.

sale baptisms, would have, every sensible reader may judge. History has stamped its destructive judgment upon them! And yet in spite of this, Catholic organs to this day have not a word of condemnation to utter against such a *misuse of the sacrament of baptism*, against such mechanical methods of Christianizing!

Only one illustration as to the manner in which these masses were baptized. In reference to the baptism of those 7 millions in Mexico, Henrion writes:* "It was impossible for want of a sufficient number of missionaries to apply to them (the masses) the entire prescribed ritual of the Roman ceremonies; the new converts were gathered together in one place and then divided into three classes. The first consisted of children, the second of women, and the third of men. Whilst a beginning was made with the children, three to four were baptized with all the ceremonies belonging to this sacrament; to the rest only water was applied, as essential to baptism. Then, in the same way with the women and with the men. And to all persons of both sexes, who were baptized on the same day, the same name was given. And although the act was much shortened in this way, it nevertheless took the whole day; and those who performed the act became so tired that they were obliged to use the right and left arms alternately, until they could not any longer lift them up."

This history is highly instructive. Our historian considers this kind of baptism as a matter of course and the mode of procedure correct, simply because for want of a sufficient number of missionaries!

It found, nevertheless, its opponents. Bishops negotiated, universities disputed whether or not those ritually irregular baptisms were valid, until at last the Pope in a bull of June 1, 1537, decided "that those, who had administered baptism without the usual ceremonies, had committed no sin, provided the circumstances excused the omission. Still, except in cases of stringent necessity, the usual ceremonies were in the future to be applied in *all* cases." Thus never a thought enters the minds of either the bishops, or the universities or the Pope, as to whether those masses were prepared inwardly or even outwardly for baptism, whether there was any guarantee for a worthy recep-

*Henrion I. 435, &c.

tion—only the question of *ceremonies* troubles them! If these are right, everything else is right, baptism is baptism. *No importance is attached to the inner conditions of salvation.* In India, too, the same course was followed as in America. Tens of thousands were baptized, who, “for want of sufficient instruction retained their superstitious customs and vices.”* No comment is needed here.

At the present day a change has taken place. Not such multitudes are baptized as in the post-Reformation period. But the cause of this is not to be found in a change of view on the sacrament of baptism, but simply in the change of times and circumstances, and perhaps also in an unconscious influence, which the more ideal and biblical evangelical practice as to baptism has had upon the Roman Church. Loud triumphal cries are indeed raised, also at present, in reference to the large numbers, as has already been shown in the bulletins of Msgr. Faurie (p. 184). And when during the year of famine in India alone, within the district occupied by the Paris Mission, in the vicariate Pondicheri, in 1877, 20,707 and in 1878, 29,420 adults were baptized, (and altogether 34,300 children, both of Christian and heathen parents;†) when in the small district of the apostolic vicariate Lutschnen (China) in one year “perhaps with too much confidential zeal, 10–11,000 were conquered;”‡ when in New Zealand the “honorable Bishop Pompallier, in a two months journey, won to the Catholic faith 15,000 Maori,—of which number we are of course not informed how many were really baptized,§ only later we hear “that the greater part had united with the Hauhaus or were altogether ignorant, indifferent and dull in reference to religion—then, such great ingatherings are lauded as a peculiar divine gift of grace bestowed upon the Roman Catholic Church.

But it is not only the great numbers, which make these baptism so suspicious and offensive; the real desecration of the sacrament lies in this, that it is so frequently administered to such as

*Henrion I. 449.

†Kath. M. 1879, 135. In the evangelical missions, too, a great increase took place, but here the masses were not at once baptized.

‡Jahrb. 1866, IV. 50. V. 17.

§Kath. M. 1877, 73.

show no trace of an inner change of heart and mind; yea without having received even the most imperfect instructions as to what baptism means.* From Thibet, the "apostolic missionary" Desgodius reports triumphantly that "with the turn of a hand *whole villages* had been converted and baptized." They were asked to say: Praise be to Jesus and to Mary, to kiss the crucifix, to make the sign of the cross and required to give up their drums. Having been previously instructed and told of the advantages as also of the duties, which they are to perform, and the vices which they are to shun, they are further told that they need not fear the attacks of the heathen because they could from now on be vigorously protected (in consequence of treaties recently made).† Often, too, adults are baptized when sick or in a critical condition, *without having been catechumens*. "Our hospitals"—writes the very honorable vicar of Madura—"are places of refuge for unbelievers. They are kept there wholly at the expense of the mission, which has the advantage of securing yearly baptismal grace to a considerable number of heathen. One seldom leaves who has not had the fortune of becoming a Christian, and *not a single one dies in unbelief*,"‡ *i. e.* unbaptized. In the apostolic vicariate Senegambia, in the time of famine, "hundreds of negroes (dying suddenly), were born again through holy baptism," without being prepared in any manner for the reception of the sacrament.§ And the same thing takes place often upon the journeys of the missionaries with individuals who are entirely unknown, and with slaves.|| In a fight, an Indian woman is struck by a ball on the forehead. "Do you wish

*Kath. M. 1877, 250, Jahrb. 1871, V. 37. 1882, II. 24. 1883, VI. 45. Hahn IV. 212. Spillmann 83, 86, &c.

†Jahrb. 1864, IV. 51, &c. Still greater success attends their efforts in Madura: Kath. M. 1880, 150; where also grace performed miracles in a short time and whole villages received the faith. With great eagerness they desired medals, holy water, the blessing upon their houses, &c., of course proofs of their special Christian piety.

‡Jahrb. 1864, V. 27. 1876, I. 37.

§Ibid. 1876, II. 48.

||Kath. M. 1876, 206. 1883, 84. Jahrb. 1864 VI. 21. 1865, II. 17. 1870, II. 28. 1878, IV. 35. In the older east-African missions the slaves of the Portuguese were baptized without further ceremony. Hahn II, 264, 279.

to die a Christian?" asked the missionary. And she having said yes, "he pours, out of a vessel, standing near, the water of regeneration upon her head."* In the older missions Henrion considers it necessary to make special mention of the fact when the missionaries are acquainted with the languages of their baptismal converts, because as a rule this was not the case. But even at the present day baptism is often administered without a knowledge of the language on the part of the one who baptizes.† What conceptions of the holy sacrament such baptisms create in the minds of the heathen, may be learned from a remark by a Congo negro, who advanced the most peculiar argument by saying that the elephant, which had not been baptized, grew nevertheless large and stout and lived a long time."‡ In most cases it is considered sufficient to acquaint the neophytes with the outer ceremonies; making the sign of the cross, bending the knees, the use of holy water, &c., besides teaching them a few prayers, and this very often after a most mechanical fashion.§ And yet the deportment of such Christians is declared to be "entirely satisfactory," yea even "wonderful," although "they scarcely know the most common prayers."|| It is even affirmed that baptism had a noticeable effect on the negroes outwardly; one need only look into their eyes in order to distinguish the baptized from the unbaptized.¶ How little stress is laid on previous instruction, a characteristic example, given by the missionary Nottrott shows. One day he asked a Catholic Kolh, who had been presented with a baptismal garment, "have you also learned something about baptism?" The reply was: "No, we need not learn beforehand as you do; we are immediately baptized." And when Nottrott examined those Catholic Christians further as to what they knew of their religion, they excused their ignorance by saying: "*We have been baptized but*

*Kath. M. 1878, 160. That in such cases also cunning, surreptitious baptisms are considered allowable, we have already seen (p. 39) in the case of Queen Rasoherina of Madagascar. A similar example from Mesopotamia. Kath. M. 1882, 148.

†Jahrb. 1871, V. 37. 1874, V. 49, 59. 1875, II. 32. 1877, I. 62. 1883, VI. 63, 64.

‡Henrion II. 345.

||Kath. M. 1884, 62.

§Ibid, I. 353. Kath. M. 81, 8.

¶Jahrb. 1880, II. 46.

a short time ago."* And what the Protestant missionary discovered, is confirmed again and again by Catholic authorities, viz.: that "thousands of their converts know scarcely anything of the Christian doctrines."†

Certainly not always and everywhere is baptism thus perverted, but wherever and whenever it is, it is *justified*. Again and again excuse is found for the ignorance and low state of morality on the part of the baptized in the insufficient number of missionaries, *but never a word of blame is uttered in reference to baptisms that take place without instruction*. As the magical view of the sacraments, so the mechanical view of the Church, justifies the superficial Roman practice of baptism. To bring the people merely into the sheepfold of the Church is considered a great success, all else must come as a matter of course. In Protestant missions, too, it happens that heathen are baptized who afterwards are found to be unworthy members; but if this is the consequence of a too hasty baptism, we blame the missionary. At all events evangelical missions look for inner qualifications on the part of their converts. Stress is laid on thorough instruction, and baptism, instead of being too soon administered, is often too long deferred. And when, after all, imperfectly instructed and inwardly unqualified subjects receive baptism, the missionary is to be blamed, but not the evangelical mission-method.

With Roman missions it is different. Here the method itself is an evil; and this again is only the consequence of Roman dogmatics and ethics. As the Roman view of the sacraments and the Church is wholly different from ours, so also its wholly different ideal of piety influences its missionary method. Its systematic equalization of Christendom and Churchdom makes its piety essentially a routine of churchly exercises. Again and again we hear Catholic mission-organs acknowledge the imperfect state of knowledge and living—these are admitted to be often *very bad*, as for example in Lagos, where "nearly all live in polygamy and vice‡"—and yet the piety of these same peo-

*Allg. M.-Z. 1884, 217.

†Kath. M. 1874, 101.

VOL. XV. No. 4.

‡Jahrb. 1877, II. 19.

ple, *i. e.* their churchly zeal, especially the worship of Mary, is praised as being "wonderful." Of the Indians in Guayana it is said: "As to their morals, much is not yet as it should be, and that a continuance in sin would exclude them from the sacraments and finally from heaven itself, they cannot comprehend; but their predilection for churchly celebrations, to which they cling tenaciously, and their zeal for works, which proceeds from a firm Portuguese belief, are praiseworthy."* Where, as in Ceylon, there is manifested attachment and obedience towards the priests, liberality for the needs of divine services, devotion for Mary, love for the Church and the holy father, there the spirit of the Catholic population is considered as being "*excellent*."† In Madagascar "the heart of the missionary is often saddened because of the disloyalty; and the difficulty experienced in raising a native ministry is due to the inconstancy of the people. Up to this day only one native could be advanced to the priesthood." And yet the piety of the people is praised, for their participation in the sacraments is such, that nothing more could be desired; and there are in existence boys- girls- and women-congregations. When the holy names of Jesus, Mary and Joseph proceed incessantly from the lips of a murderer sentenced to death and hastily baptized, this is considered a great triumph of Catholicism.‡ The wild natives of New Britain "manifested great devotion for the holy heart of Jesus and all are in possession of its picture. They likewise wear the scapular of the holy heart of Jesus." The sacraments, too, "are frequently received." Therefore "we are satisfied with our little flock," and can say to day that they are on the whole good Christians and good Catholics.§ But in spite of this "they have their faults" and fall away by the "thousands."¶ An Indian is praised by his fellow-Catholics as being an "excellent Christian," because he refuses to have anything to do with heathen sorcerers, whilst others yet entertain more or less respect for them. One day when

*Kath. M. 1880, 133. Jahrb. 1864, II. 60, where the faith of these people is called "living," but their piety more external than internal.

†Jahrb. 1879, VI. 57.

‡Ibid, 1883, IV. 45, 48. 1877, II. 45.

§Jahrb. 1877, VI. 52-56.

¶Ibid, 1869, VI. 42. 1875, III. 64.

these sorcerers tried to get admission to his sick and almost dead child, he "showed them a picture of the most holy Virgin and said: "This is the one that has bruised your master's, the devil's, head. Be careful and do not come in for she might do the same to you."* What superficial conceptions they entertain in regard to conversions may be gathered from the following characteristic remark: at an Indian station all excommunicated members had experienced a change of mind, with the exception of one, *who postpones his conversion till the next year.*† At another Indian station, where for the first time they enjoyed the presence of two priests, some in their ignorant simplicity wished to make confessions to both. The bishop, deeply impressed with their great zeal which he was obliged to repress, considered this a sign of excellent Catholic piety.‡ Their ingenious zeal for fastings and flagellations, in the case of otherwise ignorant and morally rude Christians,§ as also the worship of the cross, of the virgin Mary and the saints, in its manifold variations|| is considered a similar sign.

Considering the great value which Rome attaches to external forms and devotional exercises, it is but self-evident that these things should be placed in the fore-ground in its missionary activity and made to play a principal part in the instruction of its catechumens.

Of course they also give particular doctrinal instruction. But, not considering now the haste with which great masses are often baptized, there can be no question as to a [lack of] thorough instruction merely for want of time. Complaints as to the ignorance of their neophytes are very common, too, but this must be attributed largely to the limited knowledge of the languages of the natives on the part of the missionaries, although this may not be the case so much at present, as it was in the past. But, for this ignorance of the native languages, the Roman apostles, as is often asserted, compensate by their peculiar talent in mak-

*Ibid, 1878, IV. 49.

†Ibid, 1875, V. 69.

‡Jahrb. 1882, I. 45.

§Ibid, 1875, V. 67. Kath. M. 1883, 145.

||On the Island of Trinidad in a procession, the natives dragged along large wooden crosses, tied to their naked legs, which was doubtless regarded a special sign of piety. Zöckler, *das Kreuz Christi* (1875) 371.

ing clear to the most ignorant heathen, *in a few words*, the principal parts of the Catholic faith as well as the errors of Protestantism. But leaving all this out of question, the doctrinal instruction which is given, is much more of a specific Roman than of a general Christian character. In all the Protestant missions, on the other hand, in spite of the many divisions, the principal facts and foundation truths of Christianity are made the basis of preaching and teaching; and especially the facts of the life of Jesus as they find brief expression in the Apostolic Creed, and the demands of repentance and faith, as the main conditions of salvation. Thus these general Christian truths of faith and life seem to step very much into the background in Roman mission work. In my extensive studies in Roman mission literature, I have very seldom met with these important truths. The Gospel, *i. e.* the glad tidings: *there is a Saviour for you*, who has purchased for you forgiveness of sins and who gives you salvation through his grace, if you repent and believe in him—this apostolic foundation declaration, one hears in Roman missions very seldom. Almost throughout, Christianity, as taught by Roman missionaries, is designated as *law*—a characteristic irony of Marshall's assertion that they (the missionaries) are the privileged successors of St. Paul and their mission-method wholly his. "The laws of the Church are to them (the Catholic Christians) the laws of God—observing or transgressing which, the same consequences are attached to them—heaven or hell."* The doctrines of the Church (not of Christ), constitute the all-governing centre.

And when the missionaries explain to their catechumens the founding of the Church, they always place the dogma concerning the Pope and the privileges given to him by God, first. The new converts ask in what direction that Rome lies, where Jesus Christ placed the unchangeable throne of his vicar. When they know the direction, then they stretch their hands and visions towards the same, as if they beheld the way to heaven.†
* * * With the life of St. Peter they are well acquainted (?); they know that he continues to live on in the Popes, that he is

*Jahrb. 1874, VI. 52.

†Just as the Mohammedans with reference to Mecca.

the root of all episcopal and priestly power. Therefore, when they see how Protestant preachers exhaust themselves through eager and fruitless efforts, in order to add to the shades of death new darkness they say: that the net of St. Peter alone is capable of catching fish; the net of the heretics catches nothing, because Jesus Christ is not in the boat. * * * The priest is in their eyes what he really is in the eyes of faith: the vicar of Christ, another Saviour. Their confidence in him is unlimited, and every word of his is an oracle. * * They believe him to be the lord of the God of nature.*"

Popedom, priesthood, Mariolatry, saint- and picture-worship, mass, celibacy, fasts, making the sign of the cross, bending the knees, processions, rosaries, the use of holy water and other things stand so much in the foreground in Roman missions, that Jesus Christ and his holy Gospel are completely hidden. It must be admitted that Roman missionaries, especially in recent times, do not only develop great zeal but also practical skill in grounding their neophytes in the forms and formulas of Romanism. In doing so, they make use, according to their own expressions "of all kinds of artifices,"† a system whose very nature consists in a mere *outward drill*. Then the constant exercises in churchly ceremonies, especially in the case of people intellectually undeveloped, must, as a matter of course, lead to mere externalism. Hardly ever do we hear Roman missionaries complain about a Christianity, which has been created by such outward drill;‡ mostly they are full of praise, when their neophytes only punctually perform the specific Roman ceremonies and blindly submit to priestly authority. Of the higher spiritual and moral demands, which evangelical missionaries make on the Christianity of their converts, Roman missionaries have absolutely no comprehension. Does on the other hand a Protestant missionary complain of the slow leavening-process of the regenerating powers of the Gospel, in his young heathen converts; then the Jesuits are bold enough to write:

*Jahrb. 1874, VI. 52-54.

†Jahrb. 1873, II. 6.

‡Henrion I. 343, 392, 400, 401. Jahrb. 1879, VI. 65 we read: "Many of the Islanders repeat their catechism like parrots, without understanding much of what they say."

"Again and again do the messengers (Protestant) find that the followers of their missions may be what they pretend to be in name, but as soon as it comes to the demands of Christianity, they prove themselves mere heathen."* If the Jesuits do not complain about an external Christianity, we are not at all surprised. The kind of Christianity which satisfies them, does not satisfy our messengers. And if Roman missionaries do not find in their young Christians, even though they have come over in masses, without instruction or change of heart, remnants of heathen superstition, this also is very natural. For the Roman worship of the Virgin, of saints and images, of relics, medals, &c., offers full substitute for the old heathen customs of worshipping idols and practicing sorcery; yea, it gives them a great many fig leaves beneath which, what we call superstition, sorcery and heathenism, may be artificially hid.

That the worship of the Virgin Mary plays a principal part in Roman missions, is an established fact. Being sufficiently acquainted with Mariolatry in Roman churches at home,† one example may suffice to illustrate its effects in Roman missions abroad.

According to reports in the "Yearbooks," the French "apostle" Mailfait landed on the Chinese island Hainan in March 1850. The Catholic reports expressly state that the natives consisted of "wild tribes, who followed their natural impulses." Without a knowledge of the language, the Roman apostle "began first by giving to those entirely forsaken and utterly neglected remnants of what had been—centuries ago—a numerous Christian people, *rosaries* and *medals*, and in this way he won all hearts."

"The Passion-week drew nigh and this holy season he wished to celebrate with all the customary churchly solemnities, although he had but few means to do it with: a table instead of a baptismal-font, a bamboo reed instead of an Easter candle, &c." "Nevertheless," writes Mailfait, "with these few things our people were greatly astonished; their eyes had never beheld

*Kath. M. 1877, 238.

Allg. M.-Z. 1878, 49, &c.

†But recently I found on a grated door, with an altar devoted to Mary, in a Catholic church in Salzburg the following words: "*Einladung der verlassenen Mutter Gottes zum Gebet.*"

the like. On Good Friday we proposed to celebrate the *worship of the cross*, and on this account they came in troops already at midnight." * * "Easter was still more solemnly celebrated. One told the other that a French priest had come into the land, who performed astonishing things. Therefore they hastened together from all villages; among them an old tobacco dealer, who had come a distance of seven miles and whom the missionary kept with him as catechist. This celebration resulted in the first conversion. "On this day," writes Mr. Mailfait, "the altar was as nicely decorated as possible." "I had instructed two children in the ceremonies and they served at the altar dressed in little white gowns. A solemn high mass was held with the assistance of a little organ, which I had brought over from France and which my catechist played pretty well. The Christians were full of joy and did their utmost to brighten the solemnities. They brought petards, which were thrown up during the day in order to give the different signs."

The Marianic month of May* brought Mr. Mailfait new comforts. His filial love for the mother of God had made it his duty immediately on entering the island to recommend it for protection to the mighty Virgin. He could therefore not let this beautiful month pass without making known his filial devotion to the queen of heaven and inspire his Christians with love for Mary. "Nothing could be more edifying," he writes, "than the way and manner in which my new converts"—let it be remembered that he had been on the island now only six weeks and "scarcely knew its language"—"adored Mary during this month dedicated to her. Every morning and every evening they all came together at a certain place, which was devoted to prayer in order to say five rosary laws. At noon, one family, being purposely appointed, appeared in the name of all the rest and prayed the five remaining laws, in this way supplementing the rosary. Other, more pious souls, of their own accord, would always unite with this family. Heaven poured its richest blessing upon this little congregation. For, scarcely had the first prayers of

*How this month is celebrated in southern Italy, see Allg. ev. luth. K.-Z. 1884, 661. In the mission fields it seems also to be observed and to be noted for special conversions, which then took place. Kath. M. 1880, 151.

our hearts ascended to heaven, than the most blessed Virgin permitted her blessing to come upon my mission. On the first day a heathen living, at a distance of eight miles, came to me. He was married, and a nice young man. He had heard of the Christian religion and came to ask me to instruct him in the same. I see him yet coming in. Opposite the door stood the altar of the mother of God, adorned with the picture of the immaculate conception. When he saw this picture of Mary, he fell upon his knees and, WITHOUT KNOWING WHAT IT WAS, or what he should say, saluted it by a thousand movements of his hands and prostrations of his body. Then he asked me whether I would not instruct him. I authorized my catechist, a zealous servant of Mary, to do this. Already on the following day he knew the most necessary prayers by heart and had an idea of our holy religion. His zeal for instruction was so great, that he scarcely took time to eat. More than twenty times a day he saluted his deliverer [Mary], then returning to me and falling upon his knees said: my father, sin is in my heart, will you not blot it out through baptism? I baptized him on Pentecost in the presence of all the Christians, who were very much edified by his devotion and modest bearing. * * Even on the very day of his baptism, he wished to return to his family in order to make known the happiness, which he felt and ask them to adopt a religion, which was a source of so great comfort unto him. During the same month there came also an apostate desiring to return to the religion of his fathers. There were five other heathen who asked for holy baptism.”*

Besides the *idolized Mary*, whose central position in Roman missions has already been pointed out (p. 4 &c.†) the whole army of the saints is also introduced into the heathen world. It is very plain that to a people brought up in polytheism, the Roman worship of the saints would necessarily become a new form of idolatry. Already in the Catholic churches at home, the difference which is made between *doulia* and *latria* (adoration and worship), is only a sophistical expedient to which no attention

*Deutsche-evangelische Blätter 1884, 273, &c.

†These references to pages are to the original work of which this article forms a part.

is paid in practical life. The Roman laity bend their knees before the saints and pray to them with the same devotion as that which belongs to the living God. They give the same honor and worship to both. According to their views and practical conduct, the saint takes really the place of God. Ebrard is perfectly right when he affirms that "the practice of calling on the saints in the Roman Church, presupposes an entire omniscience on the part of the saints."* When Janssen calls this an untrue and unproved assertion and thinks he has refuted it by saying: "In and through God the saints know all about our requests,"† it is only one of those sophistical artifices, in which Jesuit apologetics are so rich. We have not the capacity even to understand such subterfuge. Either the saints are not omniscient so that God must inform them of the prayers offered to them, and then the prayers are superfluous, or they inform God of the prayers of believers, and then they are more omniscient than God himself. But the Roman laity and even the priests do not concern themselves in the least about Janssen's theological subtleties. The saint hears and answers prayer, the saint (not God) helps, to the saints thanks are given, as has been shown a thousand times in word and letter. Thus, for instance, we read in the reports from Jesuit missionaries in Sambesi: "There is scarcely one among us, who does not owe thanks to the holy Antonius. I will speak here of only one favor. Bro. Nigg one day had lost his keys. This brought us all into perplexity, because some of them belonged to the kitchen. We asked him to call on St. Antonius. But he thought St. Antonius had already too much to do for him and he (Antonius) had to go too far in order to fetch those keys (!). But at last he (Nigg) consented. Scarcely had he closed his prayer, when a negro came asking whether we had lost a bunch of keys, he had found them five miles from here. All right, these were the keys of the brother, not even one was missing. Indeed, not in vain have we commended ourselves to St. Antonius and burnt a mighty candle before his image in Brussels for two months from the day of our departure."‡

*Die Objectivität Janssens, p. 17. †Zweites Wort, 33. ‡Spillman, 61.
VOL. XV. No. 4.

And what shall we say when it is expected of the holy Joseph that he could "infuse thoughts into Christian souls;"* when the honorable Mr. Guillemain on the Island Sancian, puts a slip of parchment, which during holy mass has been placed on the altar, and which contains the names of friends and benefactors, who through their generous benevolence support our enterprises, into the tomb of Xavier, in order that through the merits of this saint they may have a happy dying hour!"†

And they treat their dear saints just as the heathen treat their idols, if they do not comply with their wishes. I scarcely trusted my own eyes when, in the year 1884, I read verbatim the following utterances of the honorable Father Augonard:‡ "On this account one evening, when I suffered more than ever before, I was almost angry at the holy Joseph and said to him: Good, holy Joseph, who art the protector of this (Congo) mission, I have labored hitherto and you have done nothing as yet. I am sick and can work no longer. Arrange matters now as you like, for I am no longer good for anything. Two days afterwards came the good P. Krafft. He had brought with him a little statue of the holy Joseph. Again I recommended to the patriarch of Nazareth my concerns and gave him to understand that he (*i. e.* his statue) would not be taken up till he had brought matters in order."

How is it possible that heathen to whom such saint-worshippers bring such saint-worship, should apprehend this worship as a worship of the one living God? That—in spite of all subtle sophistries—polytheists should distinguish between these saints and their gods and between the images of the same and their idols and instruments of sorcery? Must Rome not necessarily, however unwilling she is to admit the fact, substitute a Christian for a heathen polytheism, *i. e.* plant a Christianity, which is in reality a white-washed heathenism?

The use which is made of pictures, is of special aid in the process of substitution. As to the use of statues even the "Catholic Missions" at one time manifested a sort of doubt—of course without expressing directly its disapproval and conse-

*Jahrb. 1878, VI. 28.

†Ibid, 1869, VI. 8.

‡Jahrb. 1884, V. 52.

quently of no further weight. When a Chinese missionary urges the sending of pictures, which he intends to use as a "substitute for idols," this Jesuit organ writes: "We say (he asks) for pictures, not for statues, because these differ but little from the images, to whom the catechumens have shown devotion hitherto, and which might therefore easily become a snare to them—a reason, which in several apostolic vicariates has given rise to an absolute prohibition of statues. The pictures, on the other hand, displace the old idol statues—without leading the neophytes into the temptation (?), to transfer to them the idolatrous worship, which they formerly offered to their idols."*

But how? If after all, statues are to be found in Roman missions by the hundreds and thousands, must not this Jesuit organ admit that we are right when we affirm that "to these statues the idolatrous worship is transferred, which the Catholic heathen Christians formerly offered to their idols?" And how can it now fly into a passion, when we designate Roman Christianity as being in various ways only a "white-washed heathenism?" From a multitude of illustrations on the use of statues in Roman missions only a few:† P. Delplace writes from the Ganges: "Already I am in possession of a statue of the holy Joseph, which is cut out of wood, richly painted. Under the special protection of this glorious patriarch, I place the young Christian congregation in Kharee, just as I have placed the one in Bashanti under protection of the Immaculate Conception."‡

The apostolic vicar from Madura writes: "In the evening, after solemn vespers, a procession took place and a statue of U. L. F. of Lourdes was carried about under a magnificent baldachin amidst loud prayers and songs."§ And that to these statues the worship formerly offered to idols is transferred, we give the testimony of the Lutheran missionary Zorn in Pudukotta: "In Karambagudi are three respectable Catholic families. Of

*Kath. Miss. 1876, 240.

†Henrion, II. 455. Kath. M. 1877, 42. 1878, 103. 1881, 118. 1882, 215. 1882. Beilage, 10. Jahrb. 1865, V. 64. 1874, I. 9. 1884, V. 59. &c. &c.

‡Jahrb. 1876, V. 35.

§Kath. M. 1884, 63.

these a man came to me and asked me to come and see their house-chapel. These people have gone to great expense. There is a nice altar with candles of massive silver, a crucifix in the centre, above it an image of Mary, gilded with a gold crown, by the side St. Peter and Paul, the holy Xavier, Antonius and the arch-angel Michael. Here we pray every Sunday, said the man of the house; and once during the year the priest comes, reads mass and gives us the holy sacrament. What do you pray, said I, be honest, do you pray to these images? He said yes.* Likewise, according to the reports of the honorable Father Rabains, the pictures, which are carried about during nightly processions, are asked *for their blessing*.† Of course, these are misunderstandings of Roman doctrine; but why entertain and foster a worship that must necessarily, especially in the case of heathen, lead to such misunderstandings? The Buddhists in Barma, having been directed by Catholic priests to the ridiculousness of idol-worship, answered them: "Of such foolishness we are not guilty. In looking upon the statues of Gautama, we are only reminded of Buddha, who preaches the perfect law and on account of his perfection he has deserved to be placed in the Neibban."‡ I presume our reporter, the apostolic vicar, conceals the main part of that answer, namely: "Are you, Roman Christians, not guilty of the same ridiculousness in worshiping images?" And in case the bishop should have angrily declined and said: "These statues only remind us of Mary, Joseph, Peter, &c.," I am curious to know what reply he would have made to the Buddhist if he had declared: "Consequently there is no difference between us and you." The heathen will hardly pay attention to the difference made—perhaps only in a moment of embarrassment—by the Catholic missionaries, between statues and pictures. If they are given a visible object for "adoration," (of course not for "worship,") they treat it simply as an idol and perform with it their superstitious practices and use it as a means of sorcery, just as they did in former times their heathen idols. Of course, Catholic missionaries think of having won great victories, when they influence the heathen to exchange their idols for objects of Roman wor-

*Allg. M.-Z. 1878, 476. †Jahrb. 1870, II. 6. ‡Jahrb. 1874, II. 22.

ship. They pursue this substitutionary method systematically and consider it wise pedagogically. Thus the Jesuit Oktave, who missionates in China, wrote to his Superior in Europe: "Each time a family announces its willingness to enter the catechumenate, my joy is always clouded on hearing the words: 'Father, give us pictures, in order that we may have something as a substitute for the idols, which we have worshiped hitherto.'" It were generous to think that the father would be painfully touched by the evident lack of Christian understanding on the part of his catechumens. But not so; he is sorry that the pictures are wanting in order to effect the desired exchange. For thus he continues: "I find myself in no little difficulty, for it is impossible to comply with all their requests. For each family wishes to have a picture of its own, and that a nice, large, bright one; and without such a substitute, it is with difficulty that the new catechumens determine to let go their idols. You will therefore do your very best to send me a rich supply. You could hardly do me a greater favor."* The exchange of heathen idols for Roman pictures could not be expressed *more explicitly*.

As to the use of Bible pictures in the missions, no objection can be raised, if their use is limited, as in the case with Protestant missionaries, to illustrate Bible history and Bible doctrine. In Roman missions use is also made of pictures, often the productions of a frantic imagination, in a pedagogic-didactic way, in order to influence the ignorant heathen, either through allurements or fright to accept the Christian religion. As for instance, the North American Indians, by pictures representing the last judgment, where dragons and snakes devoured the bowels of the goddess; demons casting them down into the flames of hell, devils tearing them in pieces with thongs, &c.† As an illustration of the didactic use, which the Jesuits make of pictures, the following may suffice: "They introduced among other things a play of cards. Upon these cards, the sacraments, the principal virtues, the commandments of the Church, the mortal sins, &c.,

*Kath. M. 1876, 240.

†Relation de ce qui s'est en 1637. Fritschel 142. Kath. M. 1882, 148. Similar to day in China. Jahrb. 1873, II. 12.

were figuratively represented." "Thus our wild Indians learn how to obtain salvation whilst playing." The missionaries called this play *du point au point*, and the Iroquois Indians indulged in it passionately. It was also recommended to the priests in France to introduce it among their peasants as a suitable Sunday entertainment.*

But the didactic use of pictures stands far behind their use in worship. They were introduced principally in order to turn heathen views and usages into a different direction. Already in earlier times the Jesuits expressed themselves unreservedly by saying: "We give them (the Indians) permission to change the object of worship so that they may offer to the true God, *i. e.* to Mary and the saints, their petitions and prayers, which they before offered at their sacrifices."† We call this the *method of substitution*.

As a matter of course, out of this method grew the idolatrous worship of pictures, kissing them, investing them with miraculous power, and even attributing to them the conversion of whole tribes. Here is a single illustration from the missions among the Indians, which shows to what a fabulous extent idolatry was carried on by means of pictures.

A Huron congregation had been presented with a nice picture of the child Jesus, made of wax. The Indians looked upon it "as a present from heaven." The picture was carried from house to house in order that all might have a chance to worship it; and the priest assured them that this worship would bring them a thousand blessings from heaven. During a procession, the picture was first brought into the cabin of an old widow, who "almost died for joy." The priest made her say a prayer, as a salutation to the guest, in which she laid all that she possessed at his feet. A meal was then prepared and the guests were told that "the little Jesus was entertaining them." The picture was also used as a means of sorcery to remove family evils. When at one time a young woman refused to become reconciled to her husband, he turned to the picture and said: "Sir, you see how stubborn this woman is; be so kind, I

*Relation en 1670. Fritschel 140. †Relation en 1657. Fritschel 140.

pray you, and choose her cabin for your dwelling place and, without doubt, her heart will be softened and she will again perform her duties." And really, when the picture came, it changed the woman completely.*

And this idolatrous worship of pictures goes on to this very day. Among the many pictures, shown to the English missionary Kirkby on a visit to the Indians on the Mackinaw, in 1861, there was a large picture of Mary with the following superscription: *Veritable portrait de la très St. Vierge Marie. * * d'après le portrait peint par St. Luc Evangelist. Des graces sans nombre sont attachées à cette image.*†

Similar methods were pursued in the old South American and Congo missions. In order to have something in the place of the signs of idolatry, King Alfons distributed crucifixes and pictures of saints, which had been brought from Portugal.‡ In Japan the pictures of Buddha and other saints were changed, with few alterations, into pictures of Christ and other saints of the Roman Church.§ In India, during Romish festival processions which are introduced after heathen processions, Mary is put in place of almost any sort of heathen idols. Thus we find that in all her missions, in recent as well as in olden times, substitution is an established method sanctioned by the Church.||

Nor are they satisfied with this method of exchange and substitution. In Madura, use was made of a heathen procession wagon during a Roman procession festival.¶ The description of this celebration, which shows its entire heathen character, is too instructive to be omitted. It may serve at the same time as an illustration of the celebrations of Roman church festivals in her missions. The Jesuit Lessmann writes:

"In Madura, St. Bartholomew, whose feast was celebrated the day before, is patron of the Church. For the celebration of such a patron-festival two things are necessary: A grand procession and a religious show. The central object and main adornment is a colossal wagon, upon which is placed the statue

*Fritschel 143. †Int. 1865, 120. ‡Henriou I. 291, 390, 425, &c.

§Allg. M.-Z. 1880, 110. Griffis 252.

||*Dublin Rev.* 1884, 120.

¶Kath. M. 1874, 30. Dubois 65 relates that even the idol tower of Dschaggernat was made use of in the celebration of a Christian festival.

of the saint. This custom to drive about with such a wagon in a procession, is in imitation of the manner of the heathen. At every pagoda may be seen one or more of the wagons. On the axle of the wagon stands a short pyramid, built like the temple itself, upon which the idol, usually a colossal figure, is placed, and on certain festival days driven about. The wagon is drawn by a whole multitude of men. Now inasmuch as it is not the business of the missionaries to do away with these customs, *which are not heathenish in themselves*—for the missionaries do not intend to make of these natives European but Indian Christians—therefore they have left them their wagon and only Christianized it; for without such a wagon they would not consider it a procession at all.”*

In China a certain mountain, which is regarded holy and upon which several gods are worshiped, has been changed to a place of pilgrimage and Mary-resort. Of this the Catholic missionaries write very minutely and with great satisfaction.† In place of amulets and other means of jugglery, medals are given to the people. They are asked to kiss the crucifix, or arrangements are made for processions, in which also heathen and Mohammedans take part, who without doubt ascribe to this religious festival an infallible power, similar to their own superstitious usages.‡

In the light of such missionary methods it is no longer a wonder that such Christianity as is being propagated by Roman missionaries, reveals itself as naked heathenism as soon as those so-called Christians are left to themselves. We are not surprised that the Amazons of the king of Dahomie carry crucifixes, brought into the land by the Portuguese, as fetiches around their necks; that on the Congo crucifixes, incense-boxes, silver goblets, statues, mass books, bells and sacred robes, which the monks at their departure left behind, are used as mere fetiches; that in Elmina Mary-festivals are celebrated with fetic services, noise, dancing, and perhaps also with bacchanalian revelry; that the Indians of South America worship

*Kath. M. 1874, 30.

†1878, 89-94.

‡Jahrb. 1864, III. 78, &c. 1870, I. 31.

the cub; that in Tonkin the host effects conversions*—in short that Roman Christianity sinks down to a mere magic force, and is in reality nothing else than a whitewashed heathenism!

We have been obliged to confine ourselves to a few examples or illustrations.† Roman sources give them by the hundred. But these may suffice to prove what we affirm, viz.: that Roman missions do NOT teach the heathen the worship of God in spirit and in truth.

ARTICLE IV.

THE GENERAL SYNOD AND HOME MISSIONS.‡

By REV. CHAS. S. ALBERT, A. M., President of the Board of Home Missions, Baltimore, Md.

The 32d Convention of the General Synod occurs in a most beautiful season of the year. As we have hastened hither from North and South and East and West, nature has spread, on every side, rich and lovely sights upon which the eye has feasted with delight. What potencies have been at work to transform the earth from the deadness of Winter's ice and snow to this glory; what forces of genial sunshine and creative life to change the brown fields, the bare twigs, to the meadows carpeted with tender verdure, the fields rich with waving grain and the trees, clothed with rustling foliage, blushing with fragrant blossoms. Potencies of sun and rain, earth and life are here; but for what purpose? The answer is fruit. All life hastens without rest or cessation of labor to crown itself with fruit. The blade gives place to the ear, the ear to the full corn in the ear. The blossom is not the satisfaction, but the fruit, and for this the plant strives with what seems almost mad haste until it be accomplished. These potent powers are for result. God's pur-

*Kath. M. 1883, 90. 1880, 214. 1881, 95. Jahrb. 1871, IV. 15.

†In order not to become too diffusive, I have omitted the so-called Sacramentalism. In the Catholic churches at home, many of the consecrated objects are nothing else than a means of sorcery; but in the mission fields these consecrations effect fetich worship.

‡Delivered before the General Synod at Harrisburg.

pose is fruit, without which there is neither delight nor victory.

Whit-sunday has just passed. In the land of Judea, Pentecost was the festival of the harvest fruits, the out-come, under God, of the force of sun and rain, earth and life. On this day, in the Christian Church, new spiritual forces were given to the disciples. They were clothed with power from on high. The Holy Ghost gave them hearts of love, wisdom from above, tongues of fire. These potencies were also not for themselves. Immediately they bare witness. Peter preached the truth with love, wisdom, and fire. The first ingatherings from these forces were three thousand souls. The continuance of power, moreover, depended upon the fidelity with which they used the gifts of the Holy Ghost for the ingathering of men into the kingdom of God.

He gave them power from on high, but this power was to be used for the salvation of a world lying in darkness. He gave them new hearts, full of love toward God, but, likewise, toward men. He gave them tongues, whereby they knew mysteries and could speak in other languages, but that they might proclaim the Gospel to all lands.

It needed a persecution to teach them this. They would have remained content in their beloved home-work at Jerusalem, had not the persecution scattered them abroad.

Our heritage as a Lutheran Church is a glorious one. To us belong the first and foremost of the Reformers, Luther; the faithful Confession of Augsburg; the rich stores of the deep scriptural knowledge and systematized truth of theologians whose equals are not in the world; the living, profound and trustful piety garnered in our hymns and devotional writings; the millions who have borne and do bear the name Lutheran.

The Holy Ghost has given to us, as a Church, wisdom, power and tongues of fire, and for the continuance of these powers, he demands fruit.

It is not enough that the Church began well and has done well. It ought to show that it is doing and can do better. "Decrepit old age lives in the Past, active manhood in increased power in the Present and in lofty conceptions of the Future." *Aggression*, *Aggression* alone declares that we truly live and have both

the joy and the satisfaction of strong Christian life. The Lord Jesus says, "I must preach the Gospel in other cities and towns also." We are his disciples indeed when we burn to carry the Gospel beyond our own city, town, village, hamlet, or neighborhood, to others also. Aggressive Christianity is alone strong. The Church had died at Jerusalem if the disciples had remained there.

The Church content with the ground gained, unmindful of its high office, becomes first fossilized and then dead. Luther and the sixteenth century degenerate into the eighteenth with its formalism and lifelessness. Therefore, let us remember continuance of power, nay of hopeful, joyous, spiritual life, depends upon *aggression*. The potencies of the Church must present fruit unto the Lord.

The work of the early Church is characteristic *in its method*. The apostles found in almost every city and land the Jewish people. Through them the truth of the Old Testament was diffused and preparation made for the larger truth that comes through our Lord Jesus Christ. To these scattered bands of the chosen people, the disciples first preached the truth and then to the outlying world of heathenism, the Gentiles.

Our work is also prepared for us. All over this land are the scattered bands of Lutherans, committed to us by the providence of God. And to us it appears reasonable that we should gather congregations, beginning with them and then turn unto the rest of the world. Let us take our duty in the very largest sense. "As we have opportunity let us do good unto all men, but, specially to them which are of the household of faith."

Nor ought we to be discouraged because frequently slow progress is made. Every home missionary is ready with his testimony to affirm that oft we find it difficult to gather our own material. Lutherans and the descendants of Lutherans seem, and often are, indifferent to our own ministrations. Without a church home, they pass by the open church-door and do not enter, except once or twice perhaps in curiosity. The material is oft difficult to handle, given as it is to worldliness and in some instances to unbelief. They must be searched for, persuaded, plead with, ere they come. Why should we vex ourselves?

Because we are to meet a want and not a demand. Want is that which men need. Demand is that which they ask for. The world of traffic is organized on the law of demand and supply. This regulates business and makes prosperity. To meet the demands, the busy spindles of the factories clatter and whirr, the heavy trip-hammers fall, the trains speed along the iron track. Let the demands cease and the black clouds of smoke no longer pour out of the tall chimneys, the furnace fires glow not. Operatives leave their homes and seek labor if it may be found in other towns.

It is characteristic of the best of work, of the noblest conceptions, the highest love, of advance of thought and reformation that they meet a want and not a demand. They do speak truly to men, they are striving for the best and highest in him, but they win their way by persistent effort of word uttered and life lived against his selfishness, meanness, prejudices, until his higher self hears and the obedience is won that brings lasting peace and joy.

When our Lord Jesus Christ came, what reception was given him? They had their demands, which were of the earth, that they might reign as kings of the earth, lords as the haughty Romans were. They cried let us alone, when he would have led them into another kingdom of meekness and goodness, and refused their selfish demands. He sought to meet their deepest wants, to save them from their sins, to restore them to the Father, to give them the abiding joy of righteousness, and they took him and nailed him to the cross. Yet those teachings, that death and life have met for ages and are meeting to-day the deepest wants of the human heart and are satisfying it. He teaches us that he is god-like in his work who meets the deep spiritual wants of men and not their selfish demands.

Paul is sent of the Holy Ghost into Macedonia. The man of Macedonia cries, come over and help us. He goes. It is the cry of the deepest want of Europe but not its surface demands. He strives to help, and lo, a handful believe; he is scourged, cast into prison, and fastened in the stocks. God has made no mistake. Paul has not misunderstood, and regenerated Europe with her noble history and present prosperity attests that it is

better to meet the wants of the human race than the demands of a selfish present.

Let us in the slow upbuilding of our mission work learn this great lesson, that we are to meet the real want of men, not their demands. And yet oftentimes one is surprised to see how the want, the spiritual want of members of scattered Lutherans for a ministry, a church, with the means of grace, rises into the clear consciousness of a Christian demand. All are not indifferent and worldly. A large majority are anxious to be supplied with their own ministry and church with its loved life and doctrine.

The numbers of those who thus appeal to us and other bodies of Lutherans are enormous. The vast immigration of those of our own faith, it is estimated, numbers one congregation of five hundred souls for each day in the year. "Almost one-sixth of the population of the United States are the descendants of parents who came from the Fatherlands across the sea." It is true that the German and Scandinavian work of the General Synod is not large. Our efforts have neither been as persistent nor as commensurate with the demands as we would like. There is need of a larger supply of ministers, educational facilities and literature in these languages, but, even under these disadvantages, we have been doing much in these later years. What we may do under the deeper interest and hearty co-operation of our Synod in German and Scandinavian lines we may not tell, but the progress made in Nebraska and Wyoming and New York would indicate a magnificent future.

Whatever may be said of this, it is a matter of momentous importance that the English aggressive work, specially in the West, devolves largely upon the General Synod. Every year witnesses the anglicizing of the children of German and Scandinavian parents. There are also our own Lutherans who migrate from other States into new sections, who with their children, in addition to the former, form an immense number of our population. Who is to care for these large numbers in the next twenty-five years, almost a generation? To ask the question is to give the answer. There is work for all the Lutheran bodies in the English field, but which bodies are now equipped for present opportunities? The only body which in this generation

can be of large service and assistance to us in this work, is the General Council. A glance at her English missions in the great West shows a lamentably small number. We wish there were more. The reasons are obvious. So small proportionately is the English portion of the Council that it is overshadowed by the German and Scandinavian, and much of the strength must be used there. Her magnificent territory and membership in the East has never been thoroughly mobilized, to use a military term, and until her large charges are divided, her present eastern fields more thoroughly possessed, the General Council can spare few men for aggressive English work in the West. Neither has the General Council ever perfected the organization essential to Home-Mission work as the General Synod has, or developed the spirit of liberality in home-missions, or Church Extension as the latter.

The other bodies, excepting the General Synod South, fully occupied with its own territory, numerically small also, have made but little effort to do English work, even in the congregations now becoming anglicized, much less to accomplish aggressive work of this character. We, therefore, are forced to conclude, with reluctance, (because of the greatness of the task which needs the combined effort of all,) that upon the General Synod the aggressive English work in the West will largely depend for the next twenty-five years. It is a land of promise, but it needs that we put forth all our strength to possess it.

Do the results encourage us? The Home Mission Board has cared during the past two years for 87 missions. The accessions have been 2,381 and the total membership 6,022. On the Sunday-school roll are 9,693 scholars. Thus we minister to at least 25,000 souls. But had we the men and means, the missions might be numbered by hundreds, the souls cared for by the hundreds of thousands.

It has been sometimes urged that there is an excess of churches given to many places and no room for new organizations. So great is the zeal of the different denominations that the accommodations far exceed the requirements of the inhabitants. Those who first enter are clamorous in their demands that they are amply competent to care for the population. Yet

there are certain facts which require consideration. There is, it may be concluded, great justice in this plea where churches of practically the same doctrinal basis and cultus, each erect churches. Where, *e. g.* the different shades of Methodism each build a church and organize congregations when one congregation and one church could fairly reach and accommodate all the Methodists in a place. So with the divisions of the Baptists and different phases of Calvinism. Representing as we do Lutheran doctrine and practices and life, distinct from these, if we have material in any place, or town, it is our business to care for it, whether there be sufficient church accommodation or not in that place or town.

The real kernel of the question is just this and not the other. Is the material that belongs to us ministered to as it should be by other denominations? Is not the real truth, that church accommodations do not mean church influence over members who have no affiliation, either in doctrine or practice to these churches? That many remain who are not attracted by them, nor enter their doors, and, because uncared for, are drifting away into the world, adding to the numbers of the indifferent, the worldly and the skeptical?

We must look upon the hard realities. There may be plenty of churches but with few worshipers and no power to reach the people, as in the town in New York of 5000, where the communicants do not number 500. It is the result of experience in this work, that among our people, other denominations have failed. And, upon the establishment of a mission which grew and multiplied, they have sold their church building to these Lutherans who loved their own doctrines and life. Shall we, when such are the facts, refuse to enter and care for our own, who largely are not cared for, reclaim the wandering, build them again into the Church of God? Are we not to throw our weight and influence, under God, to roll back the worldliness, the indifference, the godlessness, the skepticism which threaten all the future of this land, as well as cause the eternal loss of those whom God has entrusted to us?

We have thus spoken of these few cases where fault is found, but these represent but a small fraction of that work which is

ours in places where our material is and where the people are without churches and ministers. What is the result of unfaithfulness to God's call for these destitute? We can look at it from this lower stand-point first, its effect upon the people of the land. The oppositions to a Christian life are many in this new land. Our very prosperity is fruitful in evil. The nation gains wealth before its people have acquired power to use and spend it wisely. Our great centers rival the ancient Romans in the luxury which led to their enervation and debasement. "Luxury induces men to listen to a voice other than the highest—the voice that teaches them to enjoy in ease and peace their great possessions and find in things material a better measure of conduct and character than in things spiritual." Greed for wealth, mad haste to be rich, business recklessly carried on, a wild speculation that is gambling, the desire for the glitter and pomp of the world, are only too fatally undermining not alone responsibility to God, but morality; and lead men to unbelief that falls in naturally with their hopes and pursuits. With it all there is a widening gulf between labor and capital, between the poor and the rich. The laboring class, so long our joy for their stability and earnest godly character, are not under the influence of the Gospel and ministry to the same extent as in former years, but are listening to the apostles of false socialism and communism, forgetful that it is the abuse of Christian truth, the failure to carry out its principles that have wrought out these evils. And so on every side the danger to us is worldliness, rejection of Christ and his teachings, unbelief in God. It is the hour for supreme effort on the part of the whole Christian Church, to retard the progress of these ideas by faithful and diligent work, by possession of the land wherever men are gathered together, that over against the godless and unbelievers there may be arrayed the Christian employer and laborer, the masses of the poor and the rich who worship together the same God who is the maker of them all. It is the hour for the Christian Church to instil the true ideas of fellowship, right and Christian love that the nation may worship God the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost, in whom alone prosperity and a gracious future may be obtained. That is the condition essential to the prog-

ress and collective well-being of a people."* The moment when a people has the noblest conception of God and the strongest faith in him, in the order he has instituted and the law he administers in his inflexible righteousness and truth, is also certain to be the moment when its spirit shall be in its sublimest and most heroic mood. Over, a sturdy Scot, valiant in speech as in deed, English Ambassador to the court of Prussia, sat at the table of Frederick the Great, then meditating a war whose sinews were to be mainly formed of English subsidies. Round the table sat French wits of the infidel sort, and they and the King made merry over decadent superstitions, the follies of the ancient faith. Suddenly the talk changed to war, and war's alarms. Said the long-silent Scot, "England would, by the help of God, stand by Prussia." "Ah," said the infidel Frederick, "I did not know you had an ally of that name;" and the infidel wits smirked applause. "So please your majesty," was the swift retort, "he is the only ally to whom we do send subsidies." There stood the truth confessed. England's best ally is God; the times of her truest heroism and magnanimity have been the times when she was most obedient to him. And as with our nation so with all. A skeptic age is never a great, or a golden age; an infidel people can never be a noble or creative people. For deed, for achievement in politics, or letters, for the highest creations in art, in poetry, or sculpture, in architecture, or painting, religion is a necessity. In seeking for people that know no God, who live without faith, or worship, where do our philosophers go? Do they select for their inquiries peoples that have stood on the highest pinnacle of civilization, and do they, while the peoples stand there, point with proud and disdainful finger to the men in whom their culture bloomed in its most splendid flower? Were the Greeks in their most splendid era of philosophy, sculpture, poetry, without faith in God? Was Rome in her heroic days without men who believed in the state as the creation and symbol of Divine Law; no stalwart sons who dared in her hour of peril ask like brave Horatius,

*Fairbairn. *The City of God.*

VOL. XV. No. 4.

How can man die better
Than in facing fearful odds,
For the ashes of his fathers
And temple of his gods?

Do they show Raphael, Angelo, Edmund Spenser, William Shakespeare, John Milton, these flowers of human culture, without faith in God? Do they go to times and men like these and silence us by these or similar results? No, not they. But they go to some cannibal South-sea Island, scarce touched by the foot, or known to the science of the white man, to some degraded and wretched African tribe, and with these specimens dug from the very heart of the most dismal barbarism they come forward and cry, "Behold, peoples who acknowledge no God!" Well then let us accept the specimen and only answer, "Compare that atheistic race of yours with our theistic races, and let the distance between cannibalism and Christian culture measure the space that divide peoples who believe in no God and peoples who believe in him and have labored to follow his spirit and fulfil his ends."

This land of ours for noblest endeavor, for the happiness and well-being of its people, for its continued prosperity and progress needs Christianity. It is the youngest of nations, reserved in time and by discovery as a Protestant land, in God's purpose to be a mighty instrumentality in the redemption of this world, and in the upbuilding of his kingdom. The time for Christian work is *now* so that deep and stable foundations may be laid for the Christian nation that is to be, so that in the years to come, the land may abide in the favor of God, may remain a bulwark against evil, the nation from whence the Gospel will be carried to all the world until all the inhabitants thereof shall praise the Lord to the glory of God the Father.

The General Synod is called to faithfulness in Christian effort and self-sacrifice, because without such effort multitudes will be without the saving ordinances of the Church. The world is both permanent and changing. Nations have a continuous life, exist for centuries. England has a history of more than one thousand years, well-defined, that presents us with the spectacle of an unbroken life that has continued and increased, amid fluctuations of prosperity and adversity. Our conception of a na-

tion is like to the conception of a noble building. As the Cathedral of Cologne that slowly rose to perfection through the centuries until at last it stands with its solid stones wrought into beauty and magnificence, so the nation seems solid, permanent and majestic. The temple of the nation is, however, made of living stones, which are not solid and ever-existing, but of short duration. Whilst the nation is continuous, the men which constitute it are ever passing away. Generations quickly appear and disappear. The men and women, the vast majority of the children of America, of the sixty million or more inhabitants, will not be here fifty years from now. Almost all will be dead, and, as they die, so shall they appear before the judgment-seat of God. The generation of to-day is our concern. If we care for it wisely, we reach the measure of our duty to them and likewise best care for the future generation. This mighty post is entrusted to us by the Master. If they are without the consolations of the Gospel, are left defenceless by the Church in the world, are therefore tempted, betrayed, defeated and lost, if we could by our effort have provided for them and given them their church, will not their blood cry out against us, that agonizing cry ascending to God, "No man cared for my soul?" Will not the children growing up in worldiness, indifference, iniquity and skepticism at the judgment accuse us before God?

How much truth there is in the following. "A missionary in the West Indies having called on the colored people for a little help in spreading the Gospel, a negro with a wooden leg came forward, and pulling from one pocket a parcel of silver, said, "That's for *me*, massa;" and another parcel from another pocket, "That's for my *wife*, massa;" and another still (in all thirteen dollars), "That's for my *child*, massa." When asked by the missionary if he was not giving too much he said, "God's work *must be done*, massa, and I *may be dead*." Let us do and let us give *now* what we can, for "God's work must be done and we may be dead."

It follows from all that has been said that the home mission work of the General Synod must be Lutheran in its methods. The General Synod is a Lutheran body. It "receives the Augsburg Confession as a correct exhibition of the fundamental doc-

trines of the word of God." The material it seeks is Lutheran, trained in this faith, inclined to the modest doctrines of that church which they and we believe to hold the teachings of the word of God in its greatest purity. Loyal to our own principles, it is common-sense and wisdom in addition, to approach these along the line of our church-life and church-doctrine. The name of Lutheran is not sufficient but the reality. The home mission work of the General Synod is doomed to failure if we do not cleave with fidelity to the truths of our Confession.

We claim that we have a right to exist since God has entrusted to us special truth. On no other ground have we a right to live, for otherwise we merely perpetuate a division of Protestantism, and unhappy weakness. If we approach our Lutheran people with other methods, doctrines and life which are foreign to our own Church they are alienated, or, if we gather them they are bound by ropes of sand, since they confess to no truth other than generalities, or rightfully belonging to others.

We commend ourselves best to the world even when true to our Confession and life, we declare that God has given us a special work and peculiar treasures. The thoughtful observer discerns that the religious world has moved in its religious conceptions toward us in these last decades. The conservative and profound teachings of the Lutheran Church centering upon the person of our Lord Jesus Christ, as they are better understood commend themselves to the thoughtful. The world will best hear us as we are faithful to our own doctrines.

To be sent of God, that gives strength to the messenger. Every missionary, every pastor that stands with support and prayer back of the missionary, to have heart in his work, must believe that as a church God has sent us to proclaim our truth. Such missionaries will commend themselves to our own material, and by a manly and thoughtful presentation of our doctrines will gain a hearing from others. Such work God has blessed in the past and will bless, I believe, in the future.

It may now be properly asked, How has the Board of Home Missions sought as the representatives of the General Synod to meet these opportunities and responsibilities?

The Board has tried to be comprehensive in its work. All

Lutherans are considered, whether they be German, Scandinavian, or English. It has endeavored to occupy as much territory as possible with the smallest expenditure consistent with successful work. Centres of population have been occupied that from them outlying and dependent neighborhoods might be reached. New work has been assumed in such fashion that new territory is possessed and yet connected with other General Synod Lutheran points already established. Isolation with corresponding weakness has been avoided. Nebraska has been strategically occupied, from thence, post by post, Wyoming and Colorado have been cared for. From Iowa and Nebraska, in the same manner, Minnesota and Dakota are to be occupied. If you had a map, and could follow, these new names would indicate this, Kearney, North Platte, Lodge Pole, Sydney, Cheyenne, Laramie, Denver, Pueblo. It has been a systematic and comprehensive advance, the reverse in intention. Yet, like in far-reaching wisdom to the southern advance of the Russians to the sea, we have boldly and systematically gone forward.

With all this the Board has not been unmindful of other opportunities, nor of the great cities. Every State has been under special supervision. Brooklyn, Philadelphia, Baltimore, Chicago, Kansas City, Denver, with their thronging multitudes have had missions given them.

The Board has made mistakes, but errors attributable to human infirmity and not to lack of thoughtfulness and care. Neither the members nor the secretaries have been spared. The Board has met often, deliberated long, canvassed with caution all matters submitted. Our secretaries have been continuously at work, they have been sent in heat and cold on the work of the Church, required to supervise missions, awaken interest by addresses to established congregations, they have traveled thousands of miles, but we hold the expense judicious, for they have encouraged the missions, reconciled difficulties, founded churches, obtained money, aroused the co-operation and quickened the benevolence of congregations. Your secretaries have been faithful servants. By their oversight they have practically saved the Church thousands of dollars; for they have prevented the reception of missions which with little material would have

been beneficiaries for a generation, and on the other hand established missions in favorable points where growth has been rapid.

No less is it due to the pastors and membership of the General Synod to acknowledge the noble help they have given. The advance in contribution has been in despite of hard times magnificent. We can judge in two ways, we may look at the ideal and compare the Church with that. She falls far short of perfection. There is a better way. To observe her past and compare with the present. If that indicates growth, then is there hope. Such has been the marvelous progress in increased benevolent contributions that we are encouraged and our hopes are high for the future. In 1868, the contributions of the General Synod to Home Missions were \$8,000, at this General Synod \$46,000. The General Synod is doing well, but we must do better. Advance, advance, let it be our watchword, for we have not done what we could. The women of the Church deserve a special tribute. Generous have been their contributions; faith and patience amid difficulties have been theirs, whilst by them and by the whole Church the Board has been upheld with a trust; they have acquiesced in its plans and respected its wishes.

And now what is it that we need?

1. A devoted Christian church-life. We are first to be devout and then practical. When the Pope showed Thomas Aquinas his treasures, he said, "No longer can the successor of the Apostle Peter say, 'Silver and gold have I none.'" "No longer," was the apt reply of the saint, "can the successor of the Apostle Peter say to the lame, 'rise, take up thy bed and walk.'" The apostles loved first and then were missionaries. From the life of an earnest faith and love the life of good flowed, the undying desire for the salvation of men. We need silver and gold. We need before it the devout Christians, whose gold shall be given out of love to the Lord, who are constrained by that love to give it, whose prayers hallow and consecrate it.

2. We need missionaries. Men adapted to the work by their gifts, which gifts have been enriched by grace. Men who are hopeful, with tact to approach men, to devise well for the future, ready to sacrifice, content with a small and hard present, for a glorious future that shall be born out of it.

Ministers godly and amply qualified for regular pastorates are by no means always missionaries. They accomplish good, but they are not pioneers, men gifted in initiatives. There are gifts, and in the spirit of the Gospel let us rejoice that to some are given the gifts of an evangelist, and let us seek to encourage such men in their labors.

3. We need more men in the ministry. Let us plead with God for them. Preach to fathers and mothers to consecrate their sons to the gospel ministry; to young men to heed God's calls that they should forego earthly ambitions and be ambassadors for Christ.

4. We need money. New missions mean new churches, fresh expenditures. Had we the men and the means, we might have in the next two years 500 missions doing gloriously, instead of 87.

5. We need literature. Books written to meet the religious and devotional wants of the membership. There has been good work in this direction, we want more. Our able men should give us Lutheran treasures, not merely in translations, but written by them at first hand, penetrated with Lutheran conceptions of truth, but adapted to the temperament and wants of an American people, mindful of their temptations and assaults. These writings should display that versatility, vigor, decisiveness, aptness of expression and felicity of illustration, which are the national traits over against the German meditateness, diffuseness, abstruseness, which repel many from their otherwise noble and profound theology. Our seminaries, our thinkers in the pulpit, ought to furnish us with material for the religious thought and culture of our people, which should retain to us the truths of our theology in their largeness and mysteriousness and profundity, and yet adapted to the spirit of the people. We ought not to be dependent on others for our literature, books which, whilst in the main good, are not unmixed oft with pernicious error. Such are the great claims made, the noble opportunities presented. Let every minister heed the call and, in congregation and in synod, seek to advance in all directions that mission work given to us of God. It calls for sacrifice and labor, but we can gladly endure these for the Master's sake.

Our joy and reward shall be in the influence we thus exert on the moral and spiritual advance of the nation, that it, kept a godly land, may, through the blessing of God upon its wealth and people, send forth gifts and men to evangelize the world.

Our joy and reward shall be in the redemption and salvation of men and women who will greet us in the world to come though we may never meet them upon this earth, men and women saved by our prayers, our gifts, our children consecrated to the ministry, and our influence given to the mission cause. When Norman Macleod was buried, as the long cortege passed through the streets of Glasgow, thousands who honored and loved him thronged to see his body carried to the grave. Then amid the multitude, a brawny working-man was heard saying, as the dark column moved past: "There goes Norman Macleod; if he had done no more than he did for my soul, he would shine as the stars forever." What a testimony! Who cannot deny himself that through him others may know the riches of Christ?

Our joy and reward shall be in our likeness to the Master, who came "not to be ministered unto, but to minister unto others and to give himself a ransom for many." It will bring upon us his approbation and lead us into the holy fellowship of his love.

Let then the Lord's tireless spirit be ours. "I must work the works of him that sent me while it is day: the night cometh when no man can work." "I must preach the Gospel in other cities and towns also."

ARTICLE V.

THE USE OF THE LORD'S PRAYER IN THE EUCHARISTIC SERVICE.

[Continued from the July QUARTERLY.]

By REV. E. J. RICHTER, Turner's Falls, Mass.

THE LITURGIES OF THE MEDÆVAL CHURCH

These present a wide and interesting field for study and investigation. According to our limited task, we give only a few explanatory remarks on these documents, but complete enough to set forth the measure of their value as evidence.

The Eastern mediæval liturgies bear, in their titles, the names of apostles and the church fathers, and this nomenclature is generally adopted by liturgiologists as a matter of convenience. "St James'" means at first nothing more than the liturgy of the Patriarchate of Jerusalem, "St. Mark's" that of Alexandria, "St. Basil's" and "St. Chrysostom's" those of Constantinople. These are the chief liturgies, some of them surrounded by a numerous kinship, both orthodox and heretic. The question of the authenticity of those names may be answered in the negative and in the affirmative, respectively. That *e. g.* St. James' liturgy, as it stands, was not and cannot have been composed by St. James the apostle, is evident. But it is no less obvious that the church of Jerusalem could not receive her communion order from another authority than from the apostles, and among these from St. James the Less, her president for many years. And when the so-called "St. James' liturgy" in its essential parts, eucharistic prayers and consecration act, commemoration and distribution, fits exactly into the frame-work, presented by the N. T. writings, and harmonizes with the panels of the same fabric which the primitive church joined into that frame-work; then the title "St. James'" may, in some sense, be regarded authentic. And so it is. The fundamental stem of these liturgies, eastern and western, is apostolic.

The codical authority by which they are supported reaches

to a greater or less degree far up into the mediæval era, the age of the manuscripts known to exist, ranging from the seventh to the thirteenth century. As a matter of course, the age of a codex is not necessarily identical with the age of the document copied. The written fixation of the typical liturgies, orthodox and heterodox, reaches back to an earlier date.

The apostolic and primitive church had no written liturgies. The stable parts were kept in memory, and the knowledge of the Lord's Prayer, the Creed, the Words of Institution, etc., formed in olden times an object of the examination which candidates for the ministry had to pass. The fluctuant parts, for instance the eucharistic prayers, were left to the ministerial capacity and experience. It is natural for prayers, frequently offered on the same occasion, to assume gradually a stated form; first in one church, then in another, at last in a diocese. The communion prayers in the "Teaching" and in the seventh book of the "Apost. Constitutions" are instances of such crystallizations. Besides, the so-called Diptychs were early committed to writing. They were records of the dead, containing the names of apostles and martyrs, and of the departed bishops, presbyters and members of the local church, to be commemorated in the general prayer. Other variable parts may also have required a written help for the minister officiating. The first attempts at writing down formularies of some completeness, appear in an ancient Ethiopic liturgy (which we passed over as being of little value for our purpose), in the so-called Clementine, and in the oldest of Gallican liturgies. The fourth century, however, when the condition of the church, in view of the support and protection granted by the secular power, was greatly changed, brought many alterations, and also a more general revision and fixation of the liturgies which, by oral tradition and some written scraps, had come down from the earliest times. Liturgical quotations of such a distinctness as those found with Chrysostom and Augustine, are scarcely conceivable without supposing written formularies to have been extant. Chrysostom's statements on the contents of the prayers over catechumens, energumanoi and penitents, of the general prayer in the mass of believers, and partly of the eucharistic prayers, possess

such minuteness and elaboration that they cannot possibly have been quoted from memory. In the caption of this chapter we styled these liturgies as "mediaeval"; but we may fairly assign their principal representatives to the end of the ancient era as well as to the middle ages.

Their literal fixation did not protect these documents from changes. They have undergone, in the lapse of time, various and considerable modifications. Parallel with the ecclesiastical development, for better or worse, in doctrine, practice, polity, they show the touches of nearly all the powerful agencies which were working and co-working in the history of the church, during the periods named. Part of these liturgies have preserved, comparatively, more simplicity and purity; part of them are ritually overladen, and doctrinally corrupted; all of them appear, in comparison with the ancient type, enriched and enlarged, both in the pro-anaphoral part and in the communion service proper. The first eucharistic prayer, indeed, nowhere reappears in such length and minuteness as in the Apostolic Constitutions, but it has been reduced and generalized. Other parts, however, originally simple, as the Invocation of the Holy Ghost or the "Sancta Sanctis," are frequently spun out into complicated performances, issuing in a series of exclamations, prayers, responses, and assuming a dramatic character. The words of institution are sometimes interrupted, after each comma, by a response of the people, either "Amen" or "We believe that it really is so." The intercessory element is much cultivated, some liturgies using, in both masses combined, from two to four shorter or longer general prayers, with unavoidable repetitions. All of the Eastern, and some of the Western rites have a great intercession within the communion service. The majority place it, as it was in the "Clementine" liturgy, after the invocation of the Holy Ghost; but some of the Egyptian group awkwardly insert it in the middle of the first eucharistic prayer, between the thanksgiving for the work of creation and the transition to the sanctus: an arrangement by which the progress of the liturgical action is greatly encumbered and protracted. But still, the very sanctuary of divine worship, though considerably enveloped by the luxuriant vines of a ritualistic propensity, has been

left unhurt. The fundamental stem of the communion liturgy—the first eucharistic prayer with the Sanctus, the second with the verba, the commemoration of the Lord's death, the distribution with the confession of the Lord's body and blood—remains unaffected. There is only one partial exception, and that in the Roman Mass, where the second eucharistic prayer has been forced away by things, more necessary, it would seem, than a thanksgiving for the blessed work of redemption.

The wonderful essential harmony of these liturgies exhibits a grand and refreshing phenomenon which, coupled with the fact that they represent the most different geographical, national and sectional divisions of the church, is a clear evidence of their having been ultimately derived from one common fountain-head. In fact, these liturgies are just as apostolic and un-apostolic, as the Church, in her successive periods, was or is herself, when using those liturgies, and manifesting by the same, one of her most prominent vital functions.

We shall include, in our comparisons, the liturgies of the heretical eastern communions, Nestorian and Monophysitic. They are helpful to the study of the subject and, in their main branches, by no means unorthodox. Some of them bear marks of a higher antiquity and of a greater purity than those of the orthodox churches. This strange appearance is accounted for by the independent and secluded position of these separated churches, by which they were enabled to retain their hereditary liturgical possession unaltered. And as the dogmatical language of the old formularies was naturally less exact and rigid, they could interpret the same consistently with their peculiar doctrinal views. The chief Nestorian liturgy, "*Adæi et Maris*," goes back beyond the time when the Persian church, in 499, gave its definitive adherence to the Nestorian doctrine, yea beyond the Council of Ephesus, A. D. 431, when Nestorius was condemned. The Syriac liturgy "*of St. James*" is common both to the orthodox and Monophysitic communities of Syria, and this remarkable fact places this liturgy in a period, prior to the Council of Chalcedon, A. D. 451, since after the schism neither body would have borrowed a liturgy from the other. With the Egyptian Monophysites, the occurrence of such names as

Basil and Cyril (of Alexandria), in the titles of their liturgies, points likewise back to a time previous to the separation. Cyril's Coptic liturgy, *e. g.* apparently presents an older type of "St. Marks'" orthodox ritual, which, in its extant form shows already the influence of Constantinople.

The classification of this extensive material fluctuates with liturgiologists, certain grounds of division naturally presenting themselves, others being arbitrary. We shall follow, in our comparative tables, a classification, commended by the latest criticism. The members of a group or family are off-shoots from one and the same main branch; the families, taken as individuals, are the main branches of one common stem. Remains of an earlier form of these main branches are to be seen in the accounts of the Fathers and in the earlier liturgical formations.

Most of the heretical liturgies are living rites, still employed in Armenia, Persia, Syria, Egypt and Ethiopia. The orthodox liturgies of Alexandria and Jerusalem were forced out of use by the ascendancy of the See of Constantinople, St. Mark's in the tenth century, St. James' gradually after the Mahometan invasion, definitively about 1200, the latter, however, as a relic being still used on St. James' day, in Jerusalem. St. Basil's and St. Chrysostom's liturgies constitute the official rite of the Greek Orthodox Church of to-day, the former having been in sole possession of that province for centuries, though afterwards greatly superseded by the latter, the local rite of the Patriarchal See, and now confined to certain days and seasons of the Christian year.

The Hispano-Gallican group to which probably the lost liturgies of Alemannia, Great Britain and Ireland once belonged, holds an intermediate position between west and east. These rites are geographically western, and in a certain direction materially so, *viz.* in their tendency to a great variableness of liturgical parts, according to the church-year, leaving even the eucharistic prayers in their ancient contents not unaffected. On the other hand, they show characteristic features, indicative of their eastern descent; *e. g.* the regular O. T. lections; the general prayer in its ancient place, at the beginning of the mass of

believers; the kiss of peace before the commencement of the communion liturgy; various exclamations of the deacon, bidding silence or attention; the invocation of the Holy Ghost; the *sancta sanctis*.

The Spanish liturgy is called "Mostarabic," *i. e.* "Arabized," denoting the ritual of churches, subject to the Arabic dominion. It was dispossessed by the Roman mass in the eleventh century, but not completely extirpated, and afterwards revived by Cardinal Ximenes who ordered its reprint and restoration, in 1500. It is said to be employed up to the present, in Toledo and Salamanca.

The Gallican branch, of which an earlier stage of development appears in the old Galican liturgies, embraced several forms: Gallican, Gotho-Gallican, Frankish, and succumbed to the Papal assaults as early as the eighth century, the rulers Pepin and Charlemagne supporting the Roman See in its endeavors to bring about uniformity.

The Roman family presents an independent growth in the Ambrosium rite which, according to its earliest monuments, was closely allied to the Hispano-Gallican group, but is now, at least in its communion part, greatly remodeled, according to the Roman mass. It has, however, preserved some peculiarities, and is in practical use in the Cathedral church of Milan.

Rome itself appears rather late on the scene of liturgical development. This fact is corroborative of the conjecture of some historians that the church of Rome, in its earliest period, used the Greek language, and a liturgy like that of Justin Martyr. The change of the language is supposed to have taken place at some time during the fourth century. The first traces of a Latin Roman liturgy became visible at the times of Innocent I. (402-17), and of Leo the Great (440-61), indicating a development independent in subordinate points, the most characteristic of which is the placing of the kiss of peace just before the approach to the altar, as it was in the African Church as early as the time of Tertullian. In other regards, the Roman ritual seems to have followed the generally adopted type, retaining *e. g.* the invocation of the Holy Ghost, as mentioned at the times of Leo the Great. But the increasing success with which the

Roman bishops were allowed to realize their pretensions of supremacy, induced them to take their own way even in liturgical revisions, and to stamp upon the order of worship the marks both of their hierarchical tendencies, and of a sad doctrinal and ritual decline.

The sacramentary which bears the name of Pope Gelasius (492-96) is, in its extant form, hardly authentic, but apparently assimilated to the later Gregorian rite; otherwise it would show an astounding rapidity in the process of deterioration. The sacramentary of Gregory the Great (Pope 590-604) is actually the Roman mass of to-day, being crammed with the all-controlling idea of a sacrifice of the mass, vitiated by pretensions of a meritorious effect of priestly performances, and stained by the cult of Mary and the Saints. The first eucharistic prayer, called preface, is reduced to a general praise of the divine majesty, and enlarged by the insertion of proper prefaces, according to special days and seasons. The second or special eucharistic prayer, one of the most devout and beautiful parts of the Greek liturgies, is disfigured beyond identification, having been replaced by a series of five prayers which contain a threefold supplication for acceptance of the oblation, an intercession for Church, Pope, clergy and people, and a commemoration of Mary, the apostles and other saints, twenty-five in all, together with an appeal to their merits and prayers. The words of institution, bating ornamental additions, both phraseological and ceremonial, have been left intact. The intercession is divided, the prayer for the living being placed before, for the dead after the consecration. The placing of the Lord's prayer immediately after the canon has been stated in a previous chapter. The customary additional prayer, "*Libera nos quaesumus*," is expanded by a renewed appeal to the intercession of Mary and the saints. The invocation of the Holy Ghost and the *sancta sanctis* are omitted, the former of which gave rise, afterward, to an animated controversy between Rome and Constantinople.

During the Middle Ages, the Gregorian "*Canon Missae*" remained unaltered, while the first part of the service, the ancient mass of *catechumens*, was enriched or at least augmented, *e. g.* by a series of five prayers after the offertory. And the Popes

gradually succeeded in introducing the Roman ritual into the whole of the western church.

This was the liturgical condition which Luther and his assistants had to face, when beginning their reform of public worship.

The Roman missal was, with slight modifications in text and rubrics, ratified by the Council of Trent, and is now the official and uniform rite of the Roman Catholic Church all over the world.

The literature on ancient and mediæval liturgies is very rich. To those who cannot make this field an object of special study, may be recommended *C. E. Hammond*, *Liturgies Eastern and Western*, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1878. It is a handy book, not expensive, presenting the material in a well grouped survey, summing up the results of previous investigations and criticisms, giving *e. g.* the quintessence of Renaudot's and Daniel's voluminous works, together with tables, glossaries, and other conveniences. The book is meant for Greek and Latin scholars. An English version of the chief liturgies, if we do not mistake the title, seems to be given in Bishop *Thomas Brett*, "Collection of the Principal Liturgies," with a dissertation upon them, 1720, reprinted 1838. An exact German version of a good selection of liturgies, with an instructive introduction, is found in *Johann Ludvig Kænig*, "Die Haupt-Liturgien der alten Kirche," Neustrelitz, 1865.

The *Lord's Prayer* will appear, in the following tables of parallel columns, with slight fluctuations as to its special position, but constantly between consecration and distribution, with the sole exception of the Ethiopic liturgy which places the Lord's Prayer after the post-communion.

I. EASTERN LITURGIES.

I. GROUP OF PALESTINE, SYRIA, (ASIA MINOR,) GREECE.

ST. JAMES, of the Land's death, of "this awful and un- bloody sacrifice."		ST. JAMES, Syria, orthodox and Monophysitic.		OTHER SYRIAC, about forty in number, Monophys.		ST. BASIL'S, Constantinople, orthodox.		ST. CHRYSOSTOM'S, Constantinople, orthodox.		GREGORY THE ILLU- MINATOR'S, Armenian, quasi-Monophys.		SS. ADEI ET MARIS, Nestorian, Chief liturgy out of three extant. Recital of the work of Redemption:	
Verba	Commemoration of the Lord's death. Oblation of "this awful and un- bloody sacrifice."	Verba	Commemoration. Oblation of "this awful and un- bloody sacrifice."	Verba	Commemoration. (Oblation seldom occurring.)	Verba	Commemoration. Oblation, "αγαπάς ἡμᾶς ὡς οὐκ ἀξιολογούμεθα"	Verba	Commemoration. Oblation of "this reasonable and unbloody service."	Verba	Commemoration. Oblation of "this reasonable and unbloody service."	Verba	Commemoration. Oblation of "this reasonable and unbloody service."
Invocation of the Holy Ghost. Great Intercession. Preface to the Lord's Prayer.	Invocation of the Holy Ghost. Great Intercession. Preface to the Lord's Prayer.	Invocation of the Holy Ghost. Great Intercession. Preface to the Lord's Prayer.	Invocation of the Holy Ghost. Great Intercession. Preface to the Lord's Prayer.	Invocation. Great Intercession. Preface to the Lord's Prayer.	Invocation. Great Intercession. Preface to the Lord's Prayer.	Invocation. Great Intercession. Preface to the Lord's Prayer.	Invocation. Great Intercession. Preface to the Lord's Prayer.	Invocation. Great Intercession. Preface to the Lord's Prayer.	Invocation. Great Intercession. Preface to the Lord's Prayer.	Invocation. Great Intercession. Preface to the Lord's Prayer.	Invocation. Great Intercession. Preface to the Lord's Prayer.	Invocation of the Holy Ghost. Prayer for Peace. Prayer for Incense. Confession of the Lord's death. Invocation	Invocation of the Holy Ghost. Prayer for Peace. Prayer for Incense. Confession of the Lord's death. Invocation
LORD'S PRAYER. Additional prayer to the same, with Doxology. Prayer of humble access.	LORD'S PRAYER. Additional prayer to the same, with Doxology. Prayer of humble access.	LORD'S PRAYER. Additional prayer, resuming the last two petitions. Prayer of humble access.	LORD'S PRAYER. Additional prayer, resuming the last two petitions. Prayer of humble access.	LORD'S PRAYER. Additional prayer. Prayers of access and for worthy reception. (Elevation.)	LORD'S PRAYER. Additional prayer. Prayers of access and for worthy reception. (Elevation.)	LORD'S PRAYER. Doxology to the Lord's Prayer. Prayer of humble access.	LORD'S PRAYER. Doxology to the Lord's Prayer. Prayer of humble access.	LORD'S PRAYER. Doxology to the Lord's Prayer. Prayer of humble access.	LORD'S PRAYER. Doxology to the Lord's Prayer. Prayer of humble access.	LORD'S PRAYER. Doxology to the Lord's Prayer. Prayer of humble access.	LORD'S PRAYER. Doxology to the Lord's Prayer. Prayer of humble access.	Prayer of humble access.	Prayer of humble access.
Elevation. Sancta Sanctis with Ikospones. Fraction, Commixture, etc., Psalms 93, 34, etc. Distribution.	Elevation. Sancta Sanctis with Ikospones. Fraction, Commixture, etc., Psalms 93, 34, etc. Distribution.	Elevation. Sancta Sanctis with Confession of the Holy Trinity. Fraction and Intinction. Distribution.	Elevation. Sancta Sanctis with Confession of the Holy Trinity. Fraction and Intinction. Distribution.	Elevation. Sancta Sanctis. (Confession of Trinity.) (The rest to be supplied with mentioned.) Distribution.	Elevation. Sancta Sanctis. (Confession of Trinity.) (The rest to be supplied with mentioned.) Distribution.	Elevation. Sancta Sanctis. Doxology to the Lord's Prayer. Prayer of humble access.	Elevation. Sancta Sanctis. Doxology to the Lord's Prayer. Prayer of humble access.	Elevation. Sancta Sanctis. Doxology to the Lord's Prayer. Prayer of humble access.	Elevation. Sancta Sanctis. Doxology to the Lord's Prayer. Prayer of humble access.	Elevation. Sancta Sanctis. Doxology to the Lord's Prayer. Prayer of humble access.	Elevation. Sancta Sanctis. Doxology to the Lord's Prayer. Prayer of humble access.	Elevation. Sancta Sanctis. Doxology to the Lord's Prayer. Prayer of humble access.	Elevation. Sancta Sanctis. Doxology to the Lord's Prayer. Prayer of humble access.

III. PERSIAN GROUP.

III. EGYPTIAN GROUP (ALEXANDRIA AND PROVINCES.)

ST. MARK'S, Greek, Alexandria, orthodox.	ST. BASIL'S, Greek, Alexandria, orthodox.	ST. GREGORY'S Greek, Alexandria, orthodox.	ST. CYRIL'S, Coptic, Monophysitic.	ST. BASIL'S, Coptic, Monophysitic.	ST. GREGORY'S, Coptic, Monophysitic.	ETHIOPIA LIT., (or Abyssinian), Monophysitic.
Verba.	Verba.	Verba.	Verba.	Verba.	Verba.	Verba.
Commemoration of the Lord's death.	Commemoration.	Commemoration.	Commemoration.	Commemoration.	Commemoration.	Commemoration.
Oblation, τὰ αὐτῶν σωτῶν δώ- ματα ἐκ τῶν σωτῶν δώ- ματ ἀποσφραγισθῆναι αὐτῶν σωτῶν	Oblation, τὰ αὐτῶν σωτῶν δώ- ματα ἐκ τῶν σωτῶν δώ- ματ ἀποσφραγισθῆναι αὐτῶν σωτῶν	Oblation, τὰ αὐτῶν σωτῶν δώ- ματα ἐκ τῶν σωτῶν δώ- ματ ἀποσφραγισθῆναι αὐτῶν σωτῶν	Oblation, hæc sancta dona pro- ponimus ex illis que tua sunt.	Oblation, offerimus tibi hæc dona ex bonis tuis.	Oblation, offerimus tibi hæc dona tua ex his que tua sunt.	Oblation, offerimus tibi hæc passem et hunc calicem.
Invocation, (elaborate).	Invocation.	Invocation, (addressed to the Son).	Invocation, (elaborate).	Invocation.	Invocation, (addressed to the Son).	Invocation.
Preface to the Lord's Prayer.	Great Intercession, Prayer of Fraction, lead- ing to the Lord's Prayer.	Great Intercession, Entrance to Fraction, Prayer of Fraction, leading to the Lord's Prayer.	Fraction with prayer, the latter leading to the Lord's Prayer.	Great Intercession, Fraction with prayer, the latter leading to the Lord's Prayer.	Great Intercession, Entrance to Fraction, Prayer of Fraction, lead- ing to the Lord's Prayer.	Prayer of Fraction.
LORD'S PRAYER. Additional prayer. Prayer of humble access and of abscess.	LORD'S PRAYER. Additional prayer. Prayer of humble access and of abscess.	LORD'S PRAYER. Additional prayer. Prayer of humble access and of abscess.	LORD'S PRAYER. Additional prayer. Prayer of humble access and of abscess.	LORD'S PRAYER. Additional prayer. Prayers of humble access and of abscess and of Absolution.	LORD'S PRAYER. Additional prayer. Prayers of humble access and of abscess and of Absolution.	Prayers of humble access and of abscess and of Absolution.
Sancta Sanctis, Confession of the true body and blood.	Sancta Sanctis, Elevation.	Sancta Sanctis, Elevation.	Sancta Sanctis, Confession of the true body and blood.	Sancta Sanctis, Another Intercession, Sancta Sanctis, Confession of the true body and blood.	Sancta Sanctis, Confession of the true body and blood.	Sancta Sanctis, Confession of the true body, etc.
Distribution.	Distribution.	Distribution.	Distribution.	Distribution.	Distribution.	Distribution.
Fraction, Commixture.						Post-Communion. LORD'S PRAYER. Collect. Benediction.

II. WESTERN LITURGIES.

I. HISPANO-GALLICAN GROUP.		II. ROMAN GROUP.				
MOZARABIC.	GALLICAN.	AMBROSIAN.	CELSEIAN.	GREGORIAN.	TRIDENTINE.	
Verba, (with 1 Cor. 11 : 26). Oratio post Pridie, variable, containing Invocation, Oblation, (that the Holy Ghost may bless, sanctify, vivify this sacrifice of the cup). Nicene Creed.* during the latter a, Fraction, b, Intercussion for the living, c, Memento for the dead. Preface (variable) to the PATER NOSTER, (Amén to each petition). Additional Prayers. Vernus cum Alleluia. Sancta Sanctis. Three-fold "Benedic- tion" : three prayers, partly varia- ble, standing for the prayer of Humble Access. "Gloria" and other Psalm verses, with Alleluia. "Panem caelestem accipiam." Prayer for worthy Reception. Sumption and Distribution.	Verba, ("Qui pridie") Collectio post Mysteria, variable, embracing Commemoration, Oblation, Invocation, (that the Father may kindly look upon this spotless, reasonable, unbloody sac- rifice, this holy bread and this salutiferous cup, and overshadow the same with the Spirit of His Son). Fraction and Commixture. Preface (variable) to the PATER NOSTER, (said by priest and people). Additional prayer, variable. Three-fold "Benedic- tion" : three prayers, partly varia- ble, standing for the prayer of Humble Access. While Choir sings the "Tre- cantem," i. e. a confession of the Holy Trinity, Sumption and Distribution take place.	Verba, (with 1 Cor. 11 : 26). Commemoration, "Unde et memores ** Fili tui beatæ passionis, etc." Oblation, "offerimus ** mæstrati tue de tuis donis ** hos- tiam puram, ** sanctam, ** immaculatam, panem sanctum vite æternæ, et calicem salutis perpetuæ." Intercussion for the Dead. "Memento etiam, Domine, etc. Fraction, while Choir sings the "Confiteor." Preface to the Lord's prayer : "Præceptis salutariibus moniti." PATER NOSTER. Additional prayer : "Libera nos, quesumus." Pax et Communicatio, etc. Offertorium for worthy Four prayers for worthy Reception, with "Panem caelestem", interspersed. Sumption and Distribution.	Verba, Commemoration of the Lord's death. Oblation, Intercussion, for the dead. (Fraction ?) Preface to the PATER NOSTER. Additional prayer. Pax, Domini, etc. Communicat, sacerdos cum omni populo.	Verba, Commemoration, Oblation, Intercussion, for the dead. Preface to the PATER NOSTER. Additional prayer. Pax. (rest not given). Agnes Dei. Four prayers for worthy Reception, with "Panem caelestem." Sumption and Distribution.	Verba, Commemoration, Oblation, Intercussion, for the dead. Preface to the PATER NOSTER. Additional prayer. Pax. Agnes Dei. Four prayers for worthy Reception, with "Panem caelestem." Sumption and Distribution.	

*Peculiar in this place.

THE GERMAN REFORMATION.

The Reformation of the sixteenth century was the actual protest against the falsifications of the Romish Mass. Its fundamental principle was, *to reform the Church on the ground of the Gospel*: not by ignoring a history of fifteen centuries, but in accordance with the pure doctrinal development, and with due regard to such traditional institutions and usages as could stand the test of Scripture and experience.

This sound principle, radical when necessary, conservative if possible, found its comprehensive and energetic application in the reform of public worship; and all the momentous questions, theoretical and practical, which may arise in carrying out so difficult and responsible a work, received thoughtful consideration and, after a process of gradual sifting, their settlement in a true evangelical spirit.

It is not surprising that so thorough a reform fell into mistakes in some specialties. The Reformers found themselves compelled to draw from a turbid stream of recent derivation; but they could not help doing so. The Roman rite constituted at that time the general liturgical type of the Western Church. Thus, by the providential course of history, it became the natural constructing link between the Church of the Reformation and the Church Universal. Nevertheless, the Roman liturgy could not claim to represent the ecumenical type of Christian cult, since it exhibited in some significant features a wilful deviation from the universal liturgical tradition which reaches back to the primitive Church. So the Roman mass needed not only a dogmatical and ethical emendation, on the ground of the Scriptures, but also a technical correction, according to science and history. It might have served as a basis for the reform; but the other western rites, suppressed by the Popes, and the Greek liturgies, ancient and mediæval, together with the testimony of the fathers, ought to have been used for comparison, and if necessary for correction or completion. Such a work, however, was impracticable at that time. A few decades later, when the Reformation had become an accomplished fact, the condition was more favorable to liturgical study, as is proved by

Flacius Illyricus and Martin Chemnitz. But Luther and his assistants, amidst the urgency of the immense task which had devolved upon them, could hardly spare the time for studying liturgics in its details, or for gathering the scattered remarks of the fathers on liturgical topics. And the formulated liturgies, now accessible to everybody, were not yet brought to light, and as far as they were, could, in their small number and isolated appearance, scarcely offer any help for broadening the liturgical horizon. The old Spanish liturgy was first published at Toledo, in 1500; St. James' at Rome, Paris and Venice, from 1526 to 1528; St. Chrysostom's 1544-48; the Ethiopian in 1548; St. Basil's in 1560; the Milan Mass in 1560; the Clementine liturgy in 1563; the Gregorian Sacramentary in 1571, etc. Thus the Reformers, were confined mainly to the narrow limits of the Roman ritual. Hence sometimes a narrowness in their liturgical views. Hence the difficulty of their discerning, in every case, the old pure elements amidst the mass of corruption, resulting *e. g.* in a lack of appreciation of so magnificent a part as the preface. Hence their incapability of conveniently filling up the void spaces, left after the elimination of vitiated portions, as appears in the non-restoration of the second eucharistic prayer, and in their embarrassment in properly introducing the words of institution. Hence sometimes a want of insight into the reasons of a liturgical structure, causing a displacement of the Lord's Prayer. Hence the loss of a few liturgical acts which are attested to by the universal voice of antiquity, but were omitted in the Roman mass. Hence their limitation to the liturgical formularies, produced by the stiff Roman spirit, and their want of contact with the fervor of devotion, as glowing in the eastern liturgies.

References to the fathers in matters of cult, discipline and polity, are frequent in the liturgical writings of the Reformation period; and so are the general appeals to the apostolic practice and to that of the ancient church. Now and then, there is also apparent some special historical knowledge. A few agenda mention Gregory's letter to the bishop Johannes of Syracuse, using it as an argument for the simplicity of the "apostolic mass" and inferring therefrom the sole use of the Lord's Prayer

along with the words of institution; so the Hanover Kirchenordnung of 1536 (A. L. Richter, *Die Evangelischen Kirchenordnungen des sechszehnten Jahrhunderts*, Weimar 1846, I. p. 275), and the Lippe KO. of 1538 (*ibid.* II. p. 494). The latter refers at once to Justin Martyr's apology, taking, as it seems, his well-known term *ἐν ᾗ λέγεται ὁ παρ' αὐτοῦ* for the Lord's Prayer, without deriving any other advantage from his beautiful liturgy. The Hanover KO. adopts the statements of Platina (†1481), *Historia de vitis Pontificum Romanorum*, enumerating the gradual additions to the first section of the mass, and giving with each part the name of the Pope who is believed to have introduced it. But these statements, borrowed by Platina from the mediæval ritualists, are, as to their historical value, almost worthless. The Brandenburg Nuremberg KO. of 1533 (Richter I. p. 201) has some general knowledge of the Greek orthodox rite and of the Milan mass.

Distinct indications of historical study, and real attempts to restore liturgical acts in their ancient significance, are found in the Pfalz Neuburg KO. of 1543, and in the Cologne Reformation of the same year. The former (Richter I. p. 28), prepared under the influence of Osiander, places between exhortation and consecration an oblation of bread and wine. This act is performed during or by a corresponding prayer which embraces at once such contents as are peculiar to the ancient invocation of the Holy Ghost. The main passage of this prayer reads thus, "Wir bringen für deine göttliche Majestät diese deine Gaben, Brot und Wein, und bitten, du wollest dieselben durch deine göttliche Gnade, Güte und Kraft heiligen, segnen und schaffen, dass dieses Brot dein Leib, und dieser Wein dein Blut sei, und allen denen, die davon essen und trinken, zum ewigen Leben lassen gedeihen." The Cologne Reformation (Richter II. p. 43), prepared by Bucer and Melancthon, at the request of Hermann, Count of Wied, Elector and Archbishop of Cologne, restores the ancient combination of the general prayer and of the contribution of voluntary offerings to one sacrificial act; introduces a dismissal of the excommunicated before the administration of the Lord's Supper, reminding of the ancient dismissal of catechumens, energumanoi, and penitents; and renews "a thanks-

giving after ancient universal custom" before the consecration, shaped in the form of the preface, combining the exact contents of the primitive general and special eucharistic prayers, and terminating in the sanctus, presenting thus a unique phenomenon in the Lutheran agenda.

These sporadical attempts to derive some advantages from the study of history failed to obtain a practical value. The oblation act of the Pfalz Neuberg KO., although framed and placed so as not to offend the Protestant mind, stands alone in the Lutheran agenda. Besides, this KO. was but short-lived, owing to the expulsion of Count-Palatine Ottheinrich from his land, by the Smalcald war. The fate of the Cologne Reformation was still worse. This noteworthy document, distinguished by piety and learning, though not free from peculiarities, exercised only a casual influence. It was in practical use in Hesse for a while, and furnished some material to the rich and remarkable Austrian KO. of 1571. According to H. A. Daniel (Cod. lit. III. p. 297), it appeared in an English version, and attracted the attention of the committee appointed for the compilation of the Book of Common Prayer. Thomas Cranmer personally inclined to the Cologne book; but for reasons of prudence, viz. regard for the adherence of the people to the old rite, he took as much as the Reformed spirit could bear, from the missals and breviaries of the old Anglican Church, improving, besides, some Reformed liturgies from the continent. So the Cologne liturgy may have suggested some general directions, but without leaving, in the Anglican rite, perceptible traces of a material influence. In its own territory, the Cologne plan of Reformation was a mere project. The Prince-Archbishop encountered in his land a hot opposition to which he finally succumbed. Suspended and excommunicated by the Pope in 1546, he resigned his dignities in 1547,—and the Cathedral of Cologne is Roman Catholic to this very day.

Taking into account all these various hindrances, it is not surprising that mistakes occurred in the liturgical reform, but it is a triumph of the power of evangelical truth that the Lutheran liturgy is as correct as it really is.

Another circumstance which has stamped one of the most

distinctive features on the outward appearance of German Lutheranism, in its home as well as in foreign countries, and which likewise explains some irregularities in the Lutheran agenda, is the lack of a common and harmonious leadership, vested in an authoritative power. There was indeed an intellectual leadership given in Luther, and a centre established in Wittenberg. The Wittenberg liturgies furnished the models to other districts, and the *Kirchenordnungen*, previously published and enacted, were sent to the Wittenberg theologians for examination, amendment and approval. But such an authority was not sufficient to prevent an endless variety. The episcopate was lost. A national Council, so much hoped for that a number of KOO were expressly introduced as provisional, was not brought about. So the secular powers took the government of the churches into their hands. The protection and assistance, coming from this side, were certainly providential, and one of the instrumentalities in God's plan for securing the success of the Reformation; but they explain also some of the human infirmities attending the work. The long list of political territories created as many ecclesiastical districts. Each country, larger or smaller, must have its own *Kirchenordnung*; and many a divine, commissioned to prepare a liturgy for some diminutive territory, could not help introducing a few ideas of his own. In addition to this, the old division of the German nation into several tribes, different in dialect, habits and views, really required some accommodation to the popular wants. Hence the variegated multiformity of liturgies with which the Lutheran Church of Germany is so amply provided, and with which she has also enriched her daughters beyond the oceans. There is indeed a common Lutheran liturgy, but it is to be discovered by way of comparison and discrimination. South-west Germany must be set aside, as exhibiting a particular type, while the north and middle German agenda, together with those of some Bavarian districts, are recognized as representing the genuine Lutheran type. But in reviewing even these, many abnormalities come to light. The majority is to decide; and even the majority is not always reliable.

After this sketch of the situation, so far as it bears in some

way or other upon our question, we turn to examine the work of the Reformers in emending the Roman mass, and especially in placing the Lord's Prayer.

Luther's Latin Mass ("Formula Missae et Communionis") of 1523 is as correct as it can be, composed as it is from the Roman model. Whatever is scriptural, has been retained, but few changes being made in the section from introit to creed. The preference given to placing the sermon before the introit, instead of after the creed, ignores the ancient bipartition of the mass. The offertory is rejected. The communion liturgy required a thorough purification. Everything that savors of oblation or sacrifice, intercession of saints, prayers for the dead, and human merit, is swept out. In this way, the proper mode of introducing the verba was lost. So Luther inserts them into the preface, just after its beginning where the subjects of thanksgiving are expected, and causes the sanctus abruptly to follow the verba. The Lord's prayer is left in its position, with the usual introduction, but without the additional prayer. The result is this order: Preface, verba, sanctus, *pater noster*, pax, agnus, prayer for worthy reception ("Domine Jesu Christe, Fili Dei vivi"), sumption and distribution.

Luther's German Mass ("Deutsche Messe vnd ordnung Gottisdiensts") of 1526 exhibits progress on one hand, and a deviation on the other. There was apparently, in Wittenberg, a desire for an out and out German order of service: undoubtedly an imperative demand of a consistent reform. But at that time, the work preparatory to a radical change of the liturgical language, linguistic and musical, had not yet been fully done. Agenda and music-books of a much later date wisely retain Latin pieces. And indeed, the Latin language, concise, and sonorous, and rhythmical as it is, eminently answers the requirements of liturgical formularies and of texts for singing. Rendering the latter into smooth German of equal merit, was not easy; and when it was done, then the musical difficulty arose. To retain the Gregorian chant was regarded out of the question. But the chant and the text were grown together; and it was a hard thing to adapt the tune to the translated text.

There was no trouble with those liturgical parts whose chant is but a solemn recitation on a given musical tone, slightly rising or falling, after certain rules, according to the grammatical incisions of the text, as it is with collects, lections, psalms, versicles, etc. But there are other parts, as introit, kyrie, gloria, graduale, credo, præfatio, sanctus, with characteristic and complicate tunes whose transfer from the Latin to the German text is about as hard a task as a metrical translation of poetry. Luther was well aware of these difficulties. In his writing "*Wider die himmlischen Propheten*" he says: "Ich wollte heute gern eine deutsche Messe haben, ich gehe auch damit um; aber ich wollte ja gerne, dass sie eine rechte deutsche Art hätte. Denn dass man den lateinischen Text dollmetschet und lateinischen Ton oder Noten behält, * * lautet nicht artig noch recht-schaffen. Es muss beides, Text und Noten, Accent, Weise und Gebärde aus rechter Mutter-sprach und Stimme kommen. * * Nun aber der Schwärmergeist darauf dringet, es *müsse* sein, * * will ich mir die Weile nehmen und weniger dazu eilen denn vorhin." In his German mass itself he highly appreciates the ancient languages, and affirms that he does not wish at all to abolish the Latin mass, but to retain it, along with the German, for the benefit of the youth; and if Greek and Hebrew were as common and familiar as Latin, and had as much of fine music and song as the Latin language has, he would like to have the mass said and sung alternately in German, Latin, Greek and Hebrew. But in preparing now a completely German liturgy, Luther seems to have yielded to some pressure. His practical skill, however, coupled with some aggressiveness, helped him wonderfully; and by some changes, substitutions, and even omissions, he overcame or avoided the difficulties, though in part not without disturbing consequences.

The *Introit* is replaced by a German hymn, or a German psalm, the latter being exemplified by Ps. 34 to which the first psalm tone is given. The ninefold *Kyrie* with its expanded melodies, varying according to festivals and seasons of the Christian year, is simplified in text and tune. The *Gloria in excelsis* with "*Laudamus te,*" like the kyrie variable in its tunes, is omitted without a word. A German *Collect* from the Latin is given,

fluent and rounded, with musical directions for its chanting. *Epistle* and *Gospel* are provided with new recitation tones, in Gregorian style, but less monotonous than those of the mediæval rite. For the *Graduale* and other chants between the pericopes, a German hymn is substituted. The *Nicene Creed* is represented by Luther's "Wir glauben all an einen Gott." In the communion liturgy, the *Verba*, privately said in the Roman canon, are set in music, in imitation of the pater noster as sung in the Roman mass. The *Sanctus* appears in the form of Luther's hymn "Jesaia dem Propheten das geschah." So almost everything was ready for a German mass.

But there stood the *Preface* as an old venerable relic, with its grand and quaint Gregorian chant. Luther did not recognize in this precious heirloom of the Church, the thanksgiving, said by the Lord in the institution of his Supper. Theologians of a later date are aware of this significance. George Calixt says, (Calvör, *Rituale ecclesiast.*, I. p. 569), "Quia Præfatio εὐχαριστίαν complectitur, and præstat quod ante distributionem et sumptionem Dominus ipse præstitit, negligendum vel insuper habendum id minime fuerit." But to Luther and other Reformers, the term "preface," first used by Cyprian for the introductory versicles, and now long since adopted for this eucharistic prayer itself, was an impediment to the understanding. This was not reckoned as a part of the canon of the mass, so it could seem to stand outside of the holy action. What was to be done with it? Transforming it into a German hymn was not practicable. Translating it into good German, and adapting the text to the tune, as we have it now, was a hard work, especially in view of the complicated and much adorned "preface tones," peculiar to the German provincial type of the Gregorian chant. In short, Luther silently *gave up the preface*, retaining the *sanctus* which he placed, in a versified form, between the *verba*.

After the *sanctus* begins the "Canon" in the Roman mass, to be said privately, and commencing with a series of five prayers which are hardly recognizable as standing for the second eucharistic prayer, including the *verba*, and so representing the εὐλογία by which the Lord blessed the elements. Luther threw away these five prayers, keeping only the *verba* into which

they lead; and for the foregoing preface he substituted *his* paraphrase of the Lord's Prayer, with a brief exhortation to communicants annexed.

This *Paraphrase*, as chiefly accounting for the subsequent perturbation of the Lutheran liturgy, deserves a special, though prevailing negative interest.

Luther surely felt, on every hand, the need of the poor ignorant people coming from the Romish Church, to be instructed, educated, and warned on every occasion. And his edifying paraphrase certainly answers this pedagogical purpose, and would do this even more if it were not unfinished. It reminds of the ancient diaconal prayers, and could be easily shaped after such models, if the congregation had been led to say, after each paragraph, the pertinent petition of the Lord's Prayer. But as the paraphrase stands, it leaves an unsatisfactory impression, as the people are called upon, at the beginning, to pray with the pastor the "Our Father," but the latter does not come.

As an element in the progress of the liturgical action, this novel part, paraphrase with exhortation, is meant to be the conclusion to a general prayer which, as it seems, followed the sermon, and at the same time a preparation to communion, forming thus a connecting link between the homiletic and the communion part of the service. The communion liturgy proper begins with the verba. Contrary to the Lord's institution there is no eucharistic prayer whatever. The verba are, at the close of the exhortation, introduced by a transitional passage, and thereupon recited as an historical report, but interrupted, owing to Luther's idea of a partial and consecutive consecration and distribution.

So the communion order is as follows: Paraphrase and exhortation; verba over the bread (with elevation); distribution of the Lord's body, while the congregation sings the German sanctus or other hymns; verba over the cup (with elevation); distribution of the Lord's blood, while the rest of the hymns or the German agnus are sung; collect of thanksgiving and benediction.

This precedence of Luther gave rise to a *transposition of the Lord's Prayer* in the eucharistic service. He had not exactly

transposed it, since he did not cause it to be said at all, but placed a paraenetic circumscription of its contents between sermon and consecration; on this wise, however, he gave the suggestion for that displacement.

The next influential agenda, the *Brunswick Kirchenordnung* of 1528, effects this transposition, placing the "our Father" before the verba, and prescribing this succession of parts: Exhortation and (or) preface (the former preferred), Lord's Prayer, verba (intermitted as with Luther), distribution. Its author is *Bugenhausen*, whose name is inseparably associated with the history of the Reformation, but whose liturgical views are sometimes of a home-made description. He says (Richter I. p. 115). "Dar hoeret nicht vele wonders in, wy moeten dar vp syn beuehl sehn." He means: administering the Lord's Supper does not require many ceremonies, but is a very simple thing, when we look upon Christ's mandate. That is correct. But the church of all ages has endeavored to speak of the Lord's sacred legacy, and to administer it, with the utmost reverence, and to endow its public celebration with such a measure of solemnity as circumstances ever may admit. Of the preface he says, "Sus mach wol totiden sulke pefatie vnde sanctus nabliuen, wente de exhortatie vam sacramento is de rechte pefatie, dat is, eyne vohr rede." (The preface may sometimes be omitted, since the exhortation is the right preface to the sacrament). We need not add anything, since the lack of understanding is obvious. In arranging the sequence of the Lord's Prayer and verba, he says, "Balde na der exhortatie, schall dat beuehl Christi vam sacramento vnde dancksegginge, bet in dat ende der missen stedes also gehoelden werden. De prester hefft also an slicht to singen dat bet von Christo beualen: Vader vnse, etc. Balde nympt he dat broet in de hand vnde bringet vp den beuehl Christi also: Unse Here Jesus Christus, etc." In this passage, the "dancksegginge" claims our special interest. The author can hardly mean the thanksgiving after reception, but bears in mind the *εὐχαριστία* of the Lord; and when he inverts the order, mentioning the thanksgiving *after* Christ's mandate, this seems to be but a casual want of exactness. In his arrangement, he gives no prayer of thanksgiving, but the Lord's Prayer;

and for its use he states no other reason but that it is the prayer ordered by Christ. Hence it must be fit for every occasion. And since the Lord first offered prayers, and then, while distributing the blessed elements, gave the disciples his mandate, our author places first a prayer, viz. the "our Father," and then the verba, containing Christ's mandate. This is, we are sorry to say, anything but a rational liturgical construction; and the cause of it lies mainly in a lack of historical knowledge.

The Brunswick KO. became typical for the agenda of many other Low-German districts, all of them having been prepared either by Bugenhagen himself or under his influence; *e. g.* those for Hamburg, Bremen, Lübeck, Sleswick-Holstein, Göttingen, Westphalia, Pomerania, etc., among which the last named, the *Pomeranian KO.* of 1535, is the best known, and one of the most notable Reformatory documents.

The Wittenberg KO. of 1533 (Richter I. p. 223), published for the Electoral Saxon territories, also adopts the displacement of the Lord's Prayer, prescribing this order: preface (facultative), our father ("for the whole congregation"), consecration ("for the communicants"). In the other parts of the service, Luther's course, taken in his German mass, is generally kept, but greatly modified in its substitutions and omissions. The singing in Latin, *e. g.* is restored for gloria, credo, etc., and on festival days even extended to collects, epistles and gospels, "so wir hie ein Universitet haben, vnd die gelerten dem Altar am negsten stehen vnd Latein verstehen." The paraphrase does not appear, being replaced by the Lord's prayer itself; but the transition which it marked from the homiletic to the eucharistic part of the service, reappears in the direction that the "our father" is meant for the whole congregation, *i. e.* communicants and non-communicants, and the consecration for the communicants. This is apparently a combination or rather confusion of that Lord's Prayer which concludes the act of general intercessions (represented in our KO. by "Da pacem and collect), and that Lord's Prayer which forms part of the communion liturgy. A similar arrangement is found in the Meissen Visitation Articles of 1539 (Richter I. p. 307). This consideration, viz. not to use the Lord's Prayer too frequently in close succession, seems to fur-

nish another explanation of its being placed before the verba. Other agenda do not regard it as a pleonasm to have the Lord's Prayer twice, at the end of the general prayer, and in the communion service, insisting however on its position before the consecration; so the Saxon Visitation Articles of 1533, the Hamburg KO. of 1539, the Calenberg and Göttingen KO. of 1542, the Pomeranian of 1542, the Nördlingen KO. of 1650, etc.

The *Saxon KO. of Duke Henry, 1539* (Richter I. p. 313), one of the ablest and most important, whose preface is signed by such names as Justus Jonas, Georgius Spalatinus, etc., pays much deference to Luther's German mass, adopting, as only some few did, even the paraphrase, but allowing it to be replaced, occasionally and on festival days, by the Latin preface and sanctus, whereupon the Lord's prayer and the verba are to follow. This KO. appeared in frequent and enlarged reprints, receiving *e. g.* all the music of Luther's German mass, together with the preface tunes from the Roman missal, and besides a wealth of collects for every occasion. Owing to the transfer of the Electorate to the Albertine line of the Saxon dynasty, in consequence of the disastrous battle of Mühlberg, this KO. became known afterwards as the Electoral Saxon KO., its most important edition being that of Elector August, 1580, which has outlasted many a change, political and ecclesiastical, and maintained its practical use in territory formerly Saxon, up to modern times, even within the Prussian "Union."

The *Mecklenberg KO. of 1552* (Richter II. p. 115), prepared under Melanchthon's influence, and having incorporated in its contents his complete "Examen der Ordinanden," obtained influence beyond the bounds of its own territory. The copy of 1554, was republished under Melanchthon's impulse as a Wittenberg KO. of 1559, and appeared also in a Low-German and a Latin translation. Its communion order is as follows: preface with sanctus (facultative), exhortation with prayer for worthy reception (facultative), Lord's Prayer, verba.

Thus the transposition of the Lord's Prayer had gained an ascendancy in North Germany, and in a number of Middle and South German agenda (Cassel, Frankfort, Worms, Palatinate, Swabia, etc.)

Before presenting the other side, we wish to state how the Lord's Prayer was handled in its accidental parts, irrespective of its placement.

The majority of agenda *confine the Lord's Prayer*, as Gregory did, *to the minister officiating*, because of its close proximity to the consecration act. The people's share in this prayer finds its sole expression in the response of Amen. A number of South German agenda, however, (Wurtemberg, Baden, Palatinate), restore the Lord's Prayer to the congregation, either to be said, or to be sung in the shape of Luther's hymn "Vater unser im Himmelreich." The ancient *preface* or *introduction* to this prayer was retained by Luther in his Latin mass, and by some of the earliest agenda, in the Roman or a similar formula, *e. g.* *Lasst uns beten, wie uns der Herr Christus Jesus befohlen hat, dass wir aus rechter Zuversicht und Vertrauen dürfen sagen.*" But the majority, without a visible reason, reduce this passage to the simple formula "Lasst uns beten." The *additional prayer* occurs but sporadically. The *doxology* is added in some few agenda, while the general Lutheran usage concludes the Lord's Prayer, as used in the communion service, with the seventh petition.

It is a fact that the majority of the Lutheran agenda place the Lord's Prayer before the *verba*. But it is no less a fact that a considerable minority, part of them ranking high for their character and influence, and covering provinces, larger in some cases than half a dozen of the numerous duodecimo territories, retain, in accordance with Luther's Latin mass, the Lord's Prayer in its ancient position, between consecration and distribution. These are, in their chronological order, as follows:

Ordnung Christlicher Messe, anonymous, Wittenberg, 1524 (Löhes' Agenda p. 35, 49): *preface*, *sanctus*, *verba*, LORD'S PRAYER, brief prayer for worthy reception, confession of the true body and blood, distribution.

Landesordnung des Herzogthums Preussen, 1525: *preface*, *verba*, (inserted), *sanctus*, LORD'S PRAYER, *agnus*, *pax*, brief exhortation, distribution.

Andreas Döber's Nuremberg Mass, 1525 (Löhe p. 47, etc.): LORD'S PRAYER *after consecration*.

Strassburg Teutsch Kirchenampt, 1525, facsimile reprint, secured by Carl Reinthaler: 1. brief admonition to call upon the Holy Ghost that he may make our bodies a living sacrifice, holy and acceptable unto God. 2. preface and sanctus. 3. general prayer for Church, rulers, people, conversion of the world, hunger for God's grace, concluding with "durch Jesum Christum unsern Herrn:" 4. "Welcher am nechsten tag vor seim leyden das brot nam," etc.: *verba* in this way connected. 5. introduction to the Lord's Prayer, urging, on the ground of Christ's sacred legacy, the confidence and right of God's children and heirs to approach him with his own Son's prayer. 6. LORD'S PRAYER. 7. Brief additional prayer, resuming the last petition. 8. Agnus ("Du Lemblin Gottes, der du hiennymbst," etc.) 9. Short prayer for efficacious reception (from "Domine Jesu Christe, Fili Dei vivi"). 10. Brief exhortation (facultative). 11. Distribution.

Erfurt Deutsch Kirchenampt, 1526 (Löhe p. 47; Schöberlein, Schatz, I. p. 20, 47): LORD'S PRAYER *after consecration*.

Minden KO., 1530: strictly following *Luther's Formula Missae*.

Riga KO., 1530: preface, *verba* (inserted), sanctus, LORD'S PRAYER.

Joachim Slüter's Low German Mass, Rostock, 1531, prepared from Döber's Nuremberg mass, reprinted Swerin, 1858: preface, *verba* (inserted), sanctus, introduction to the Lord's Prayer from Luke 11:1 and Matt. 6:7, LORD'S PRAYER, additional prayer, pax, agnus, exhortation, prayer for worthy reception, distribution.

Brandenburg Nuremberg KO., 1533: exhortation ("Ihr Al-lerliebsten in Gott, dieweil wir jetzo, etc.," from Döber's mass), *verba*, LORD'S PRAYER, pax, distribution.

March of Brandenburg KO., 1540, one of the most important and interesting, on account both of the extent of its territory and its marked character. It represents the tendency of a high-churchly conservatism, owing to the decided attitude of Elector Joachim II., whose tenacious adherence to traditional usages was with a noble liberality tolerated, and at the same

time indirectly criticised, in a vein of fine humor, by Luther in his well-known reply to the "Dome Provost" Buchholtzer of Berlin. Communion service as follows: offertory, preface, sanctus (all in Latin), during sanctus general intercessions, *verba* (sung) with elevation, LORD'S PRAYER (sung) with introduction, agnus (Latin), pax (sung), two or three Latin collects for worthy access (from the missae), exhortation (from Brandenburg Nuremberg), distribution. After the death of the bishop of Brandenburg and the establishment of the Consistorial polity, this KO. was remodeled and republished, in 1572 and '73, as Elector Georg's Agenda, Visitations- and Consistorial-Ordnung, with slight modifications of some traditional rites, and, as for the Lord's Prayer, conformed to the prevalent practice of placing it before the verba. This KO. was the main historical foundation on which the Agenda of the Prussian "Evangelische Landeskirche" were based, in 1821 and '29. *

Pfalz Neuberg KO., 1543: exhortation ("Ihr Allerliebsten in Gott"), oblation of bread and wine with corresponding prayer, *verba* (with elevation), sanctus or hymn during which general intercessions, LORD'S PRAYER, agnus, distribution.

Cologne Reformation, 1543: dismissal of the excommunicate, admonition to non-communicants and communicants, thanksgiving "according to ancient common usage," sanctus (Latin and German, choir and people alternating), *verba* with the amen of the people, LORD'S PRAYER, pax, distribution.

Veit Dietrich's Agendbüchlein für die Pfarrherren auf dem Land, Nuremberg, 1546, a private work, but much used and often reprinted: exhortation ("Ihr Allerliebsten"), *verba*, sanctus, LORD'S PRAYER, pax, distribution, agnus.

KO. for Courland and Semgallen in Livonia, 1570, follows the Prussian KO. of 1525, placing the LORD'S PRAYER *after the consecration*.

(The *Austrian KO.*, 1571, grants liberty to have the Lord's Prayer before or after the verba, and uses it once again in the post-communion act).

The result is a dissension among the Lutheran Agenda. One part leaves the Lord's Prayer in its ancient and constant place, where it was since Tertullian, preparatory to the approach to

the altar; the other part removes it into a position before the verba where it stands now as a problem, either instead of the eucharistic prayers, or as some kind of consecration prayer. But neither part seems to be conscious of a mutual opposition; neither part gives perceptible reasons for its procedure, except those which we tried to gather from a glance into the work-shop of the composers of liturgies. The place of the Lord's Prayer seems to be regarded as immaterial. Its removal was under various untoward circumstances inaugurated by some leading authorities, and the followers, preoccupied, stepped into the same traces. But that displacement is not an adiaphoron. In this holy action every thing ought to be well considered, and arranged with the utmost carefulness. That the "our Father" cannot represent the Lord's thanksgiving has been sufficiently emphasized. That it cannot stand for a consecration prayer, effecting some general preliminary dedication or sanctification of the elements, is self-evident. C. M. Pfaff († 1760) says, "Nihil enim in oratione ista exstat, quod ad benedictionem symbolorum eucharisticorum perficiendam spectet." Our search in the writings of modern liturgiologists, for a solution of that problem, has failed to reach a satisfactory result. T. Kliefoth believes that the Reformers felt the fact of having to do, in the holy communion, with the Lord and his words alone, wherefore they preferred his own prayer to prayers of human composition. L. Schöberlein explains: the Lord's Prayer was justly understood as meaning a sanctification of the communicants; but as this preparatory act might be deemed appropriate sooner or later in the course of the action, the place of the Lord's Prayer was different, accordingly. W. Löhe and T. Harnack simply restore it to its ancient position.

As the Lutheran Church is not a new Church, originated in the sixteenth century, but represents the Christian Church, as developed under the guidance of the Holy Ghost, in its purity; and as she is not a sect, fostering particular human inventions of her own, even in matters of cult, but lays a just claim to the character of true catholicity: those of her liturgical documents which deviate in a specialty from the ecumenical type of Christian liturgy, are to be CORRECTED on the ground of their own

principle by which they either stand or fall. After this correction, the affirmation of the Augsburg Confession, in its epilogue, will be the more an actual truth, "that in doctrine and ceremonies among us there is nothing received contrary to Scripture or to the Catholic [Universal Christian] Church."

ARTICLE VI.

NOTICES OF NEW PUBLICATIONS.

G. P. PUTNAM'S SONS, NEW YORK AND LONDON.

Bible Characters. Being Selections from Sermons of Alexander Gardener Mercer, D. D. (1817-1882). With a brief Memoir of him by Manton Marble. pp. 335. 1885.

Dr. Mercer was a minister in the Episcopal Communion, a man of great intellectual accomplishments and extraordinary pulpit powers, which were exercised among the cultured audiences of Newport and Boston. The present series of brief discourses on "Bible Characters" were prepared solely for his pulpit, and after his death were selected from his manuscript remains and upon urgent solicitation given for publication.

The author displays uncommon faculties for the treatment of these examples from sacred history. He is, first of all, quite successful in demonstrating their representative and typical character. They are not ideal or unique personages, but specimens of our common human nature, not so very remote from any one of us, their wickedness marking the horrible development of those beginnings of evil, of which we are all conscious, their saintly virtues but revealing the nobler possibilities within reach of every one.

Then, too, these sermons disclose remarkable insight into the human breast, a penetration into the depths of the heart that amounts to intuition. With this is combined such a clear analysis of the individual qualities and such a bold delineation of features that these ancient celebrities are made to stand before us in veritable forms, flesh and spirit reproduced in vivid portraits, their virtues and vices such as are familiar at the present day.

A slight mark, a single act or utterance is often seized upon, just as a few bones from an extinct animal serve the naturalist for the construction of the unknown original, and by means of that the individuality of the man, the whole character is portrayed. In the forcible words of the editor, "For such intuition of human character as his, a slight trace, a faint intimation is enough. With certainty and ease he produces the

full extent and significance of the scriptural lines, lays out their implications, recreates, as it were, their temporal environment and that spiritual world of which they form a part but imply the whole, until the portrait of Caleb coming from Eschol has the life-like solidity of that of David, psalmist and king, and all Gallio seems known to us no less than the character of Saul of Tarsus."

The style is at once chaste, vigorous and impressive. The reader is charmed as well as instructed on every page and must wonder by times at the origin of the slur "dull as a sermon." It is a volume that will form a valuable addition to any library, but is to be especially commended to the rising generation of ministers, who will find it very helpful in the study of Bible characters and very serviceable as a lofty-model of pulpit excellence.

HARPER & BROTHERS, FRANKLIN SQUARE, NEW YORK.

Old Times in the Colonies. By Charles Carlton Coffin, Author of "The Boys of '76," "The Story of Liberty," &c. Quarto. pp. 460. 1881.

This is not strictly a new book, but it possesses those merits which keep it ever new and ever in demand by boys and girls of educated tastes. It belongs to that series of favorites with the young which Mr. Coffin has written from time to time on American history, properly filling the gap between "The Story of Liberty," which traced a chain of events through a period of five hundred years, from the signing of the Magna Charta to the settlement of Jamestown and Plymouth, and "The Boys of '76," a narrative of the battles of the Revolution. "Old Times in the Colonies" covers the period from the discovery and settlement of America to the Revolutionary War.

In clear and attractive style the author details the principal events that transpired during the colonial period of our country, and portrays the hardships and sufferings of those who laid the foundations of a new empire. He shows how the Old World laws, habits and customs were gradually changed; how the grand ideas of Freedom and the Rights of Man took root and flourished.

Apart from the stirring and captivating interest which attaches to our colonial period, the importance of the struggle which then transpired can never be overestimated. It is still a question in many minds whether the conflict between France and England in the colonies or the great contest of the Revolution was the more momentous struggle. Greater problems were undoubtedly solved by the former, and more decisive results contributed to the destiny of the human race. During the colonial wars it was the question between Freedom and Absolutism, between an empire which the principles of liberty and Protestantism should transform into a universal home for man, or one from which the spirit of liberty was forever to be excluded by Jesuitism and French Despotism. The success of Wolfe at Quebec determined the fortunes of Amer-

ica and Europe and the world for a thousand years. That struggle is well portrayed by Mr. Coffin and he writes throughout with the heart and mind of a Protestant.

AMERICAN TRACT SOCIETY, NEW YORK.

Leaders in Modern Philanthropy. By William Garden Blaikie, D. D., LL. D., Edinburg, Scotland. With Fifteen Portraits. pp. 296.

Dr. Blaikie writes with a fluent and forceful style and has produced a most interesting and wholesome volume in his "Leaders in Modern Philanthropy." In hasty sketches and glowing outlines he has portrayed the nobler traits of character and the grand philanthropic enterprises which gave distinction to the names of Howard, Wilberforce, Chalmers, Guthrie, Livingstone, Elizabeth Fry and others. All his subjects are persons of striking individuality, who would have achieved greatness in any sphere and whose lives even apart from their noble deeds for humanity are possessed of many charming features. Some will be surprised to discover how large a proportion of these British philanthropists were either of Quaker origin or Quaker sympathies. In the case of all, however, it is notable that the spirit of Christianity gave the impulse to their benevolent, unselfish and far-reaching endeavors for the amelioration of their kind. It was in fact the special object of these biographical sketches to show the connection between a vigorous faith in Christ and the labor of love in the service of man. And one can hardly read them without experiencing the strengthening of his faith in man as well as in God.

MACMILLAN & CO., CAMBRIDGE AND LONDON.

The New Testament in the Original Greek. The text revised by Brooke Foss Wescott, D. D. and Fenton John Anthony Hort, D. D. pp. 618. 12mo. 1885.

Wescott and Hort hold the foremost rank among Greek and Biblical scholars, and their edition of the New Testament in 1881 is pronounced by competent judges as the purest Greek text extant. Some thirty years of research and labor have been devoted to this task and the result, combining as it does the brilliant productions of former editors, such as Lachman, Tischendorf and Tregelles, constitutes the most important contribution yet made to the critical study of the original text of the New Testament. The revisers who were favored with advanced proof-sheets of this edition, were largely controlled by it on all matters pertaining to the text.

The edition before us is a smaller reproduction of the edition of 1881, following the second and corrected impression of the larger edition. Its advantage over that is found in the more convenient form and much lower price, while type and text remain the same. Additional simplicity has been gained by removing all strictly alternative marginal readings from the margin to the foot of the page, and by transferring to the

end of the volume all such rejected readings as had been allowed to stand in the margin on account of some special interest, together with such other rejected readings as were noticed only in the Appendix. It is destined to be *the* pocket edition of all who love to read the Scriptures in the original.

LUTHERISCHER-CONCORDIA-VERLAG, ST. LOUIS, MO.

Tanz und Theaterbesuch. Je zwei freie Vorträge hierüber, in vier dazu veranstalteten Erbauungsstunden gehalten und auf Grund stenographischer Aufzeichnungen auf Wunsch seiner Gemeinde veröffentlicht von C. F. W. Walther, Pfarrer der ersten deutschen evangelisch lutherischen Gesamtgemeinde ungeänderter Augsburgischen Confession Zu St. Louis, Mo. pp. 100. 1885.

This little octavo attractively bound and executed throughout in the most substantial style, contains four discourses delivered by the venerable Dr. Walther on the subject of dancing and attending the theatre. The four collegiate churches composing the congregation of which Dr. W. still remains pastor held a united service for this purpose on four different occasions during last October and November, and two discourses on dancing and two on the theatre were delivered to overflowing congregations.

That dancing as it is in vogue with the world conflicts with the sixth Commandment and is altogether irreconcilable with the life of a Christian, is very strongly set forth and on grounds that are unassailable. The discourses on the theatre abound with citations from heathen as well as Christian writers, and even from actors, testifying to the immoral and pernicious influences of the stage.

Some will be surprised to learn that in October 1778 the American Congress adopted resolutions urging the States to take the most effective measures for the suppression of theatrical entertainments as being at war with religion and good morals, which are the foundations of liberty and the public welfare; and declaring that any one in the service of the United States, who shall take part in a play, or encourage or attend the same, "shall be deemed incapable of holding his office and shall be dismissed from the service of the United States." How is this for our boasted progress?

Biblische Geschichten für Unterklassen. pp. 147. 1885.

This is an admirable compendium of biblical history for the young. It is given in the simple phraseology of the Scriptures, divided into seventy-seven lessons and furnished with a profusion of wood-cuts, much better in design and execution than is usual in elementary works of this character. Each chapter is closed with a bible-text of a devotional nature which serves as a fitting spiritual commentary on the history which it contains. The representation of God by the picture of a man is of very questionable propriety and is condemned by many as savoring of

idolatry. Apart from two such illustrations it is to be commended to all families and schools in which children know or are learning the German.

First Reader. Illustrated. pp. 51.

Here is a little work in English from the same press, exciting our admiration for the enterprise and wisdom which characterizes these German Lutherans, who not only maintain their own Christian schools in every congregation, but who also provide their own text-books, thus shielding their children from the insidious secularism which so completely dominates in our public schools. We know of no American publishing-house that surpasses the "Concordia" in either the contents or the mechanical execution of their school-books.

Achter Synodalbericht des Illinois Districts der deutschen ev.-luth. Synode von Missouri, Ohio u. a. Staaten. pp. 93. 1885.

Dritter Synodalbericht des Wisconsin-Districts der deutschen ev.-luth. Synode von. Missouri, &c. pp. 79. 1885.

There is possibly to be found in no other Christian body so much solid reading matter in the minutes of synodical conventions. It appears that no division of the great Missouri Synod ever holds a meeting without the discussion of doctrinal questions. The Proceedings of the Illinois district contain an excellent paper covering sixty pages on the subject of eternal life, by Pastor Albert Brauer. Those of the Wisconsin district contain an able discussion by Pastor H. Sprengeler, extending over fifty pages on the thesis: "A thoroughly grounded, genuine Lutheran congregation believes with the heart in the real presence of the body and blood of Christ in the Holy Supper and endeavors to guard against anyone partaking of the same with her unto his condemnation." In regard to the formula of the Prussian Agenda: "Christ says, This is my Body," it is claimed that after having appeared first in a few Reformed and Rationalist liturgies it was appropriated by the United Church and adopted in the new Prussian Agenda, at the instance of the Unionistic (unirtgesinnte) theologian Marheinecke for the express purpose of being used both by the Reformed and the Lutherans. "This formula has accordingly in the Prussian Union no other meaning than that Christ indeed says, 'This is my Body,' &c., but how these words are to be understood must be left to the individual judgment."

The same house also sends us the two following tracts, likewise set for the defense of the faith, as these Missouri Lutherans most firmly hold it.

Die sogenannten Evangelischen oder Unirten. Was lehren sie in ihren Katechismen? Und warum können wir mit ihnen nicht in Kirchengemeinschaft stehen?

Warum sollen wir an unserer deutschen evang.-lutherischen Kirche festhalten?

J. A. SCHULTZE, COLUMBUS, OHIO.

Dr. Martin Luther's House-Postil, or Sermons on the Gospels for the Sundays and Principal Festivals of the Church-year. Translated from the German. Vol. III. pp. 410. 1884.

Luther excelled as a father nearly as much as he proved himself the model of a Reformer. For a while he preached regularly in his own house to the children and other members of his household, holding that it was a matter of conscience to him to preach thus as the head of a family.

The style and contents of these sermons differ very little, if at all, from his pulpit deliverances, being marked by great simplicity, evangelical doctrine and searching practical application. The translation is well done. We have never seen Luther rendered into better English, and yet the translation remains very faithful to the original. We find on comparison that he has followed the Dietrich Edition of the *Haus-Postille*. The reader is referred to Vol. XIV. of the *QUARTERLY*, p. 628, for the history of the two editions. This third volume of the translation contains the sermons from Trinity Sunday to the twenty-fifth Sunday after Trinity, in all twenty-seven, there being two for Trinity Sunday. Preachers and laymen ought to supply themselves with this valuable work. Whatever may be said of Luther's discourses as homiletical models or as specimens of fine writing, we look in vain for a sounder or more effective exposition of gospel truth than that which characterizes his preaching. Nor is his genius more marked in anything than in the stimulating and impregnating power of all his writings. Contact with such a mind is in the highest degree profitable. If one wishes to stir up and kindle his dormant and sluggish energies let him by all means study the electric Luther.

CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS, NEW YORK.

American Presbyterianism. Its Origin and Early History. Together with an Appendix of Letters and Documents, many of which have recently been discovered. By Charles Augustus Briggs, D. D., Davenport Professor of Hebrew and the Cognate languages in the Union Theological Seminary, New York City. With Maps. pp. xviii. 373, cxlii. 1885.

Whatever comes from the pen of Dr. Briggs is sure to reveal, on every page, his learning, earnestness, painstaking and independence. He always writes like an author, who has something to say, who knows how to say it, and who is not afraid to say it. His history of American Presbyterianism is a very valuable contribution to the ecclesiastical history of this country, useful not only to Presbyterians but to every one that has an intelligent interest in the progress of our common Christianity, and our own religious or national history.

VOL. XV. No. 4.

80

One of the most notable features of American Presbyterianism is its relation to English Puritanism. Though the Presbyterians were long engaged in a bitter struggle with Independency for civil and ecclesiastical supremacy in England, the Presbyterianism of this country is as much the child of English Puritanism as it is of Scotch Calvinism. The Westminster Assembly was controlled by the Puritans and the general type of spiritual life and opinion among the Presbyterians of the Colonies was largely, if not predominantly, derived from that party in the mother country. On this part of his subject Dr. Briggs is eminently just and pronounced.

As a scientific historian, Dr. B. not only traces American Presbyterianism to British and Continental Calvinism, but he also discriminates Calvinism from Lutheranism. Here, to our regret, he does not furnish the sources of his material or offer the liberal citations from original authorities with which the ample appendix supplements the body of the work. That a man of Dr. Briggs' learning, candor and freedom from denominational bigotry should repeat against Luther the stale and outworn charge of Consubstantiation is simply astounding, and to us utterly unaccountable. We challenge him to produce a single recognized Lutheran theologian who ever used the term or acknowledged the doctrine implied by it, as held either by Luther or the Lutheran Church. If he fails in this let him surrender this vulgar misrepresentation of the foremost Protestant denomination to the stupid and slanderous bigots from whom nothing better could be expected. He has a few other faults to pick at Luther. For instance, the Reformer was content with the doctrine of justification by faith alone. Calvinism advanced beyond him "in the doctrine of salvation by the divine grace alone." If this distinction means anything it means that the chronic claim to Luther by the Presbyterians because in his doctrine of salvation by grace alone he was out and out a Calvinist, is disavowed by one of the most eminent Presbyterian divines.

Again, the Lutheran Church is charged with tying "the divine grace too closely to the Word and Sacraments." This is Dr. B's opinion, but it was not the view of that able exponent of Presbyterian doctrine, Dr. Charles Hodge, who in his *Systematic Theology*, Vol. I. p. 68, teaches that the inward influence of the Spirit is through the word, and in Vol. III. p. 466, declares "The Word of God, so far as adults are concerned, is an indispensable means of salvation." Dr. Hodge must have been a Lutheran! Dr. Briggs makes a great deal of this theory of saving grace outside the means of grace divinely instituted. It forms the basis of his amazing claim that "the Calvinistic system of grace is the most comprehensive and liberal of all Christian systems. It recognizes the salvation by the divine grace of men who are incapable of being outwardly called by the ministry of the word or reached by the means

of grace." And yet he expresses regret that "Presbyterianism has been too often represented by spurious types which were not born of Presbyterianism, but were the children of Anabaptism." Now this doctrine of the Spirit's agency apart from the external form and letter of Scripture was the very first-born of Anabaptism, a subversion of truth so revolting to Luther that he was ready "to smite such a Holy Ghost on the mouth." It is sad enough that such a bastard progeny has been anywhere welcomed into the Presbyterian family—but it is surprising that Prof. B. recognizes neither its parentage nor its true character. That these same Anabaptists, when it suited their purpose, were guilty of an absurd literalism, only reveals one of the inconsistencies of fanaticism.

But inconsistencies are not confined to the enthusiasts. They seem to attach even to the splendid system of Calvinism. For here a learned historian of that system holds that it recognizes the salvation of some who are incapable of being outwardly called by the ministry of the Word, and yet the Westminster Confession says: "Much less can men, not professing the Christian religion, be saved in any other way whatsoever, be they never so diligent to frame their lives according to the light of nature," etc. The author has confounded us by this antinome just as he did by the statement that "the sovereignty does not limit the grace of God, but the grace of God is ever supreme and determines the sovereignty," but our perplexity here found relief a few sentences on where it is admitted that "there have been forms of Calvinism which have hedged in the divine electing grace with sovereignty and with arbitrariness." Calvinism and castiron are after all not synonymous.

The Influence of the Apostle Paul on the Development of Christianity.

By Otto Pfeiderer, D. D., Professor of Theology in the University of Berlin. Translated by J. Frederick Smith. [The Hibbert Lectures, 1885]. pp. 237, 1885.

The reader will find both interest and profit in this volume. The profit, however, will not come by reception of the author's views, but from the instructive short-coming everywhere manifest in the labored attempt of an able writer to make an erroneous theory consistent with itself or with the irreducible facts involved. The book is a study of a great historical and religious phenomenon, and the real truth in the case becomes more firmly established to the thoughtful reader's view by the incredibilities which plainly attach to this different explanation.

Dr. Pfeiderer belongs to the class of theologians whose rejection of a supernatural inspiration of the Scriptures leaves them in full liberty to treat them as erroneous as to facts and doctrines. This liberty he uses in the freest license. Following Baur, whom he mentions as "distinguished equally for his learning, his critical acumen and his constructive genius, who first succeeded in forever scattering the thick

mists of traditional illusion which had settled over the early years of our religion, and obtaining a connected and critically established view of the actual development of primitive Christianity," he finds the chief element of Paul's influence in an exaggerated notion of his antagonism to the rest of the apostles, primarily on the relation of Christians to the law, and then on justification by faith alone and almost all the great features of Christianity. He finds Paul coming into religious convictions in a very naturalistic way, progressing in and modifying his views and statements under the influence of his contention with his opponents and the expediency of the circumstances of his labors. Throughout, the representation implies that he was guided by his own reasonings, and that the power of his unique influence in determining the mould of Christian views, as well as his lofty ideals of religious verity, was due simply to his peculiar and superb genius. The great divergence of his Christological and Soteriological views from the rest of the apostles, is represented as causing an ever-present and exciting conflict in the apostolic churches, traceable in all the gospels and epistles. The ingenuity with which Dr. Pfeiderer finds traces of this strife illustrates the facility men acquire in finding what they seek for. The Apocalypse—not held as written by the apostle John—is supposed to be written by some Jewish Christian, taking various occasions to condemn Paul and his friends. The Gospel by St. Mark is claimed to be a Pauline defense, and the Gospel by Matthew a reply. Mat. 5 : 19 is viewed as referring to Paul, and 7 : 21, 23 to those Paulinists who call Jesus Lord but slight the law. In *Luke* a moderate Paulinism is again heard, and our author finds reference to this conflict in the account of the commission given to the seventy, the beautiful story of the sisters, Martha and Mary, and the narrative of the two disciples on the way to Emmaus.

The author's account of the order and motives of the writing of the gospels is self-refuting. It alleges intentions on the part of the writers which, if the interpretations given are to be accepted, have been carried out in a style of oblique indirection and covert allusion, that is at once unnatural and without example in the history of controversy. The theory is inconsistent with the straight-forward candor which marked the evangelists.

S. C. GRIGGS & CO., CHICAGO.

Fichte's Science of Knowledge. A Critical Exposition. By Charles Carroll Everett, D. D., Bussey Professor of Theology in Harvard University. Author of "The Science of Thought."

Hegel's Aesthetics. A Critical Exposition. By John Steinfort Kedney, S. T. D., Professor of Divinity in the Seabury Divinity School, Fairbault, Minnesota. Author of "The Beautiful and the Sublime."

These two volumes belong to the "German Philosophical Classics for English readers and students," edited by Prof. George S. Morris, of

the University of Michigan. They harmonize in method and purpose with Prof. Morris' exposition of "Kant's Critique of the Pure Reason," and Prof. Watson's explanation of "Schelling's Transcendental Idealism," heretofore favorably noticed in this REVIEW. And like them, they are valuable contributions to the help of English reading students in understanding the course of metaphysical thought in Germany.

Prof. Everett, in a few well-chosen statements, has given a view of Fichte as a man and his personal relations to Kant, that sheds light on his philosophical tendencies and work. This is followed by an account of the development and modification he gave to Kant's teaching and which prepared the way for Schelling. The exposition is marked by clear insight into Fichte's teaching, fine analytic power, and apt statement of the distinguishing features and defects of his philosophy.

In Prof. Kedney's exposition of Hegel's *Æsthetics*, we have an interesting discussion of the philosophy and principles of art. The value of the exposition is not alone in its presenting the teaching of Hegel, but in the dissenting or modifying views with which the author accompanies Hegel's statements. Both these volumes deserve to be carefully read by our students of philosophy.

Complete Rhetoric. By Alfred H. Welsh, A. M.

Professor Welsh calls his book *The Complete Rhetoric*, probably because it embraces a somewhat wider range of topics than has been customary of late in works of this kind. It does in fact include all the topics usually treated under the head of rhetoric. Sublimity, beauty and wit are restored to their old place. The book, however, can in no sense be regarded as an important contribution to literature. There is little originality in the treatment of any part of the subject, and the main value of the book will consist in the opportunity it gives teachers of going over the whole subject with their classes without a change of text-book.

GINN & CO., BOSTON.

Outlines of Practical Philosophy. Dictated portions of the Lectures of Hermann Lotze. Translated and edited by George T. Ladd, Professor of Philosophy in Yale College. pp. 156. 1885.

Lotze occupied front rank in Germany in the conflict with pantheism and materialism. With his wide knowledge of science and philosophy, his critical acumen and calm judgment, he was remarkably equipped for the great service he accomplished in the interest of theistic truth. Scarcely any one has done more to show the unphilosophical character of the materialism of Vogt, Moleschott, Büchner and their followers.

Prof. Ladd is doing an excellent service in giving the series of "Outlines" of Lotze's lectures to the American public. That it is appreciated is seen in the favorable reception given to the two volumes which

have preceded this--the *Outlines of Metaphysics* and the *Outlines of Philosophy of Religion*.

The present volume presents two divisions the first giving a very brief statement of ethical principles, and the second discussing what is commonly understood by applied ethics. The idea of *value* underlies Lotze's conception of moral good. The value, however, is not worth to self, but to others, and the conclusion is reached that "the idea of benevolence must give us the sole supreme principle of all moral conduct." The application of the principle thus outlined is, in the second part, carried through a discussion of its relation to the individual, to marriage and the family, the intercourse of men, society, and the state. It is throughout full of interest, and students of the questions involved will be glad to have the opportunity, through these pages, of knowing the views of so prominent a teacher.

THOMAS WHITAKER, NEW YORK.

The Christian Ministry at the Close of the Nineteenth Century. By Rt. Rev. A. N. Littlejohn, D. D., LL. D., Bishop of Long Island. pp. 430. 1884.

In this volume we have the first series of lectures on the foundation of "The Bishop Paddock Lectureship." This is a foundation created by Geo. A. Jarvis of Brooklyn, N. Y., in the General Theological Seminary of the Protestant Episcopal Church, and named by him in honor of the Bishop of Massachusetts. The first series of lectures, thus provided for, were delivered in 1884 and form a large volume.

The subject here discussed has the advantage of being not only in itself a practical one, but one which is just now attracting wide discussion. Apart from the instruction and counsel given to the students of the seminary, the eminent lecturer is well deserving of being heard by the public on the important questions the subject is raising. Of the twelve lectures which form the book, the first views the Christian Ministry at the bar of criticism. The second considers the causes which have hindered or impaired its influence. The third notes the evidences of its intellectual vigor and activity, followed by others on its activity in Christian and scientific ethics and in apologetics and Biblical Criticism, on the material and training of the ministry, on preaching, on the clergy as educators, on improved methods in the cure of souls, dogmatic teaching, "The New Theology," and character. The discussion shows everywhere wide knowledge, fine culture and discriminating judgment.

Bishop Littlejohn has, very naturally for him, largely made the term Christian Ministry synonymous with Episcopal Ministry. Yet the vigorous treatment he gives of the questions which concern its power and right influence will serve well for the ministry in all branches of the Church. The high standard he insists on, as to personal character,

qualifications, wisdom, and consecration, make the reading of the volume a tonic for ministerial life and service.

H. L. HASTINGS, BOSTON.

S. BAQSTER & SONS, LONDON.

The Errors of Evolution. An Examination of the Nebular Theory, Geological Evolution, The Origin of Life, and Darwinism. By Robert Patterson, author of "The Fables of Infidelity." Edited, with an Introduction by H. L. Hastings, Editor of *The Christian*. Boston. pp. 271.

The author of this volume has evidently read much of the scientific discussion of our times, and freely uses the knowledge thus gained in the examination here conducted. He has been impressed with the immense assumptions which mark much of the reasoning by which the evolutionist hypothesis, especially in its materialistic form, is sought to be established and counted as science. He is justly concerned at the religious skepticism that evolutionist speculation causes—unsettling the minds of many and overthrowing their Christian faith. And he rightly thinks that the immense literary activity of the advocates of the hypothesis of atheistic evolution ought to be met by a correspondent activity of Christian writers in maintaining the truth. But it is questionable whether he has taken the best way for the accomplishment of the worthy end he seeks. The book is earnest and bright, and brings into clear view many of the weak points and conflicting relations in the teachings of evolutionism. He deals many strokes on the absurdities in which its advocates often involve themselves. But he has weakened the force of it all by his intensely polemic method, his too free use of epithet, ridicule and denunciation. However merited some of his epithets, ridicule, and varied characterizations may be, the good aim of the book would be better served by their omission. In questions such as this nothing is gained and much lost by the free use of these weapons.

The following books have been received and will be noticed in our next number.

The Holy Bible. Containing the Old and New Testaments, translated out of the original tongues, being the version set forth A. D. 1611, compared with the most ancient authorities, and revised. Harper and Brothers.

Eight Studies of the Lord's Day. Houghton Mifflin & Co.

The Riverside Parallel Bible. The Holy Bible arranged in parallel columns with the revised versions of 1881 and 1885. 4to. pp. 1304, 408. The same.

General History of the Christian Religion and Church: from the German of Dr. Augustus Geauder, translated by Joseph Torrey.

Thirteenth American Edition, revised, corrected and enlarged. Six volumes. The same.

Church History in Brief. By Rev. James C. Moffat, D. D., Professor of Church History, Princeton. pp. 492. Presbyterian Board of Publication.

Scotland's Influence on Civilization. By the Rev. L. J. Halsey, D. D., LL. D. pp. 256. The same.

In His Steps. A book for young Christians setting out to follow Christ. By J. R. Miller. pp. 120. The same.

Tent and Saddle Life in the Holy Land. By Rev. David Van Horne, D. D. pp. 352. American Sunday-School Union.

Daniel the Prophet. By Rev. E. B. Pusey, D. D. Funk & Wagnalls, New York. pp. 519.

Apostolic Life, as Revealed in the Acts of the Apostles. By Joseph Parker, D. D. Funk & Wagnalls, New York. pp. 357.

History of the People of the United States. Vol. II. By John Bach McMaster. D. Appleton & Co., New York. pp. 656.

The Story of Greece. By Prof. James A. Harrison. "The Story of the Nations" Series. G. P. Putnam's Sons, New York. pp. 515.

PERIODICALS.

The periodicals published by the Harper Bros., New York. viz., the *Monthly Magazine*, *Weekly*, *Bazar*, and *Young People*, have been coming regularly and are highly appreciated. Each occupies a leading place in its own sphere, and we heartily recommend them.

